THE WEEKLY CHICAGO TIMES.

A Democratic Newspaper published every Thursday Morning, by Sheahan & Price, at No. 119 Dearborn Street

VOL. 5. CHICAGO, THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 14, 1858. NO. 36.

THE WEEKLY TIMES,

Containing all the reading matter of the Daily, is published every Thursday Morning.

SHEAHAN & PRICE, Publishers and Proprietors.

JAMES W. SHEAHAN. WILLIAM PRICE.

TERMS—Single Subscribers, per annum, in advance, $1.50. To Clubs of Ten and upwards, $1.00.

THE DAILY TIMES,

Published every morning, (except Monday,) at 119 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

TERMS—$6.00 per annum, in advance—12½ cents per week, payable to the Carriers.

TIMES JOB PRINTING OFFICE,

119 Dearborn street.

Where all orders for Job Printing will meet with prompt attention.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR TREASURER,
WILLIAM B. FONDEY, *of Sangamon.*

FOR SUP'T OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
AUGUSTUS C. FRENCH, *of St. Clair.*

NOMINATIONS FOR CONGRESS.

1st District—HIRAM [illegible]
2d District—GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG.
3d District—THOMAS DYER.
4th District—JAMES W. DAVIDSON.
5th District—ISAAC N. MORRIS.
6th District—THOMAS L. HARRIS.
7th District—JAMES C. ROBINSON.
8th District—PHILIP B. FOUKE.
9th District—JOHN A. LOGAN.

SENATOR DOUGLAS

Will address the people of Illinois at the times and places mentioned below:

Alton	Madison co.	Friday,	Oct. 15
[illegible]	Macoupin co.	Saturday,	Oct. 16
Decatur	Macon co.	Monday,	Oct. 18
Springfield	Sangamon co.	Wednesday,	Oct. 20
Atlanta	Logan co.	Thursday,	Oct. 21
Bloomington	McLean co.	Friday,	Oct. 22
Toulon	Stark co.	Saturday,	Oct. 23
Geneseo	Henry co.	Tuesday,	Oct. 26
Rock Island	Rock Island co.	Friday,	Oct. 29

Douglas and Lincoln.

Will address the people in joint debate at the following places and times:

Alton, Madison county, ... October 15.

Douglas will open the discussion at Galesburg and Alton, and speak one hour, Lincoln will follow and speak one hour and a half, and Douglas will reply for half an hour. At Quincy, Lincoln will open the discussion, Douglas reply, and Lincoln rejoin.

Assisting Providence.

The Republican Convention in DeKalb County resolved to place slavery in a position where the public mind may rest in the belief that it will become ultimately extinct "*in God's own time*," whereupon a writer in the *Sentinel* suggests that "perhaps God will thank the Republican party for placing the slavery question in a position where He can reach it." Farnsworth said, "So help me God, I will never vote for the admission of a Slave State," yet at the same session of Congress voted to admit Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution, should it be adopted by the people.

An Irishman Discovered.

Every morning the Chicago *Tribune and Press* has a letter or two from correspondents, stating that at such and such a place, an Irishman appeared and asked for employment "to reap corn;" but in every case upon inquiry, it turned out that the fellow is some wandering Irishman trying to locate himself until election, in order that he may vote illegally for Douglas. As this wandering "reaper of corn" has turned up in half the counties of the State, the Republicans are alarmed lest whole regiments of Irishmen are going about seeking "corn to reap," and places to vote in. In order to relieve the alarm of our neighbors, we have, by pigeon express, ascertained that the fellow is a man named Furnoy, an Irish Republican, who plundered the city government, and is now a fugitive from justice. He knows how to reap other people's corn first rate. He carries a certificate from Deacon Bross, Long John, and the *Tribune* office, that he is a communicant in a Protestant church, and not an ignorant Catholic; he has only committed forgery and perjury!

Senatorial Vacancies.

We have a letter from a friend at Elgin proposing the following question:

"Should our legislature fail at the coming session to elect a United States Senator in place of Mr Douglas, will a 'vacancy' occur on the 3d of March next, and in that event will the Governor have the power to appoint for a temporary period?"

We know that the Republicans in the North, utterly despairing of carrying the legislature, are speculating frantically on an union with some Danites (whom they imagine will be in the legislature) to prevent an election, and thus create "a vacancy."

For the information of our correspondent, whose question is in all probability suggested by threats on the part of the Republicans in Kane, we will say, that the Senate has long since decided, and in the last case, (Phelps of Vermont,) by an unanimous vote, that the failure of a legislature to elect a Senator for a new term, did not create such "a vacancy" as the constitution authorized the Governor of a State to fill by a temporary appointment. On the 4th of March next will commence a new Senatorial term, and until that has once been filled by an election in the manner prescribed in the constitution, no "vacancy" can occur. The failure of the legislature to elect will not, therefore, confer the power on the Governor to appoint a successor, but will leave the State without a full representation in the Senate.

It is well that the people of Illinois should understand and remember that the Republicans in their desperation, already threaten revolutionary proceedings, and that they threaten in case the people decide in favor of Douglas, to defeat that decision, leave the State unrepresented, and introduce into our State those tactics of political disorganization which have proved so disgraceful and injurious to other States.

Long John gives it up.

It is well known that Wentworth is utterly opposed to Lincoln's election. That he is bitterly hostile to Douglas cannot be doubted, but he never had any idea of allowing Lincoln to be elected. He has long since made the arrangement that should there be a Republican legislature, there will be eight Republican members, from the northern part of the State who, like Judd in 1855, will refuse to vote for Lincoln, and thus compel the choice of a northern senator. Trumbull will be greatly gratified by having a senator chosen from a more northern part of the State than Springfield. Hence Wentworth, though he has abused Douglas with a hearty good will, has never said a kind word in favor of Lincoln. But after Lincoln's Chicago speech, he gave up the contest and left the State. The recent nomination of Peck has determined Wentworth still more in his indifference to the election of Lincoln. He has been for several weeks in New Hampshire, illustrating to the people of that State by practical demonstration, the evils of intemperance, and we find in the Portsmouth (New Hampshire) *Gazette*, his opinion as to the result of the election in this State.

Long John Wentworth, a notorious Illinois politician, was here the first of the week, and in a conversation was asked, by a leading Democrat, his opinion of Douglas and the great contest now progressing in his State. He answered:

"My opinion, sir! my opinion of Douglas is, that he is a d——d rascal, but he is a big one, too, and carries his points against opposition that any other man would break down under. He has got courage, sir, and forces his way, and the people will follow him. He is a d——d scoundrel, sir, but he will be elected senator—and you Buchanan men down here will have to take him for President yet. D——n him!"

Lincoln having fully endorsed the Dred Scott decision by declaring that negroes are not citizens, and having gone still further and declared that if the Supreme Court had declared that Illinois had authority to make negroes citizens, he would resist it, and having thus given a flat contradiction to his own cherished theory that the Declaration of Independence asserted that "all men (including negroes) were created equal," Wentworth is prepared to rejoice over his defeat. He may pretend that for harmony he will support Lincoln just as he does Peck, but look out for thunder after the election.

There are, we understand, a dozen letters in town from Wentworth, advising his particular friends not to bet against Douglas, or Fondey and French.

John S. Bear, the "Buckeye blacksmith," who became famous as a stump speaker throughout the log cabin and hard cider campaign of 1840, has turned up as a candidate for Congress in the fourth Congressional district of Philadelphia.

How Old Whigs may Dispose of One Abolitionist.

In 1856, the vote in the 4th Congressional district for President was as follows: Fremont, 14,918; Buchanan, 13,419; Fillmore, 3,928. For Congress, the vote stood: Kellogg, (Rep.) 16,175; Davidson, (Dem.) 14,474, showing that Kellogg received 1,257, and Davidson 1,055 of the Fillmore votes, leaving 1,614 of the old Whigs who voted for Fillmore that did not vote for either Kellogg or Davidson.

The same candidates are now before the people of the district for Congress. Kellogg, during his short time in Congress, has shown himself, by vote and speech, to be as ultra an abolitionist as Farnsworth or Lovejoy. He repudiates everything national, and sustains everything sectional. He rejects Crittenden and John Bell as political associates, and claims kindred with Giddings and Hale. He scorns the teachings of Webster and Clay, but repeats with great unction the unholy prayers of Lovejoy. He prefers civil war and disunion to the admission of a slave State, if the people of such new State ask it, and, in the most solemn manner, declares his determination to adhere to the teachings of abolitionism. He thinks, with Giddings, that Fillmore, in signing the fugitive slave law, committed an outrage upon the people of the Union, and, with Lovejoy, clamors for the repeal of that act—the result of Clay's last brilliant efforts in Congress, and the work of the patriotic men who carried the compromise measures of 1850. He might not personally assist, like Lovejoy, in running off the negroes of other people, but he would tear from the statute book the remedy which the constitution provides for their recapture. When Crittenden was in Fillmore's cabinet, his first opinion, as Attorney General, was upon the constitutionality of the fugitive slave act, and Kellogg, with Lovejoy and Farnsworth, declares that Crittenden sanctioned the greatest outrage ever perpetrated upon the rights of citizens in giving that opinion.

Whigs of the Fourth district—particularly you men of Tazewell, Mason, Fulton, Peoria and Stark—this man Kellogg, just from the halls of Congress, with the maledictions of abolitionism fresh upon his lips, and rejoicing in the votes he gave to overturn the great acts of Clay, Webster, Fillmore and Crittenden, asks you to re-elect him. Twelve hundred of you voted for him in 1856 under the belief that he was not an abolitionist. Will you do so again? What took place then cannot be recalled; but, remembering the proverb, that when a man betrays your confidence once the fault is his, but, if knowing his former teachings you allow him to repeat it, the fault is your own, will you be again deceived? Do you, Whigs of the fourth district, desire to be represented again by an abolitionist. Or, do you wish to be represented by one who will take his stand upon the national platform erected in 1850 by Clay, Douglas, Fillmore, Harris, Webster, Richardson, and Crittenden? Do you wish the Whigs of Kentucky, Tennessee, and other States to believe that the old spirit of Clay and Webster has left no memories in Illinois, but that abolitionism has clouded everything with such dingy, dusky hues, that to your eyes Lovejoy, and Kellogg, and Farnsworth have become the brightest stars in the political constellation? When Henry Clay, during the memorable struggle in the session of 1850 declared, with great enthusiasm, that he would willingly exchange all those men calling themselves "Whigs," but really abolitionists, who resisted him and Webster in their great work, for an equal number of Democrats such as Douglas, Shields, and Richardson, he little thought that out here in Illinois, in the old Whig counties, his friends and the friends and supporters of Fillmore and Webster, [illegible] to curse the North, to curse the South, to curse the entire Union, by electing such men as Lovejoy, Farnsworth and Kellogg. Whigs of Tazewell, of Fulton, of Peoria, of Mason, of Stark, of Warren, and Woodford, will you send a man to Congress, authorized by your endorsement of his past acts, to throw odium upon the memory and the policy of Clay; to denounce Fillmore as a "Doughface," and treat Crittenden as an alien and an enemy? If you wish to avoid the responsibility of such an act, vote against Mr Kellogg. You have tried him once, and he has declared himself an abolitionist? Do not let him have the power to misrepresent you again. You have it in your power to say whether he shall represent you again.

In 1850, Henry Clay stood up in the Senate with Daniel Webster, resisting an administration which they had aided in electing, because that administration was attempting to force the Wilmot Proviso upon the territories of the Union. In that hour, when he had arrayed against him the entire power and patronage of the government—with the great bulk of his own party called to the support of the administration—he stepped outside of party, and called upon Douglas and the gallant Democracy of Illinois and the Northwest to sustain him. They did sustain him, and he lived to see his great Compromise measures, through their aid, enacted into laws. He, aided by the Democracy, baffled all the power of an adverse administration, and restored peace to a distracted nation. His last prayers were that his political friends would stand by those men of either party who would resist the dangerous doctrines of the extremists of both sections.

In 1858, Douglas, and that same Democracy of Illinois who had so nobly and so successfully aided Henry Clay in the crowning act of his political career, stood up in Congress resisting a measure proposed by an administration which they had aided in electing. It was this time a struggle against the extremists of the other section. In that struggle, the friends of Clay, lead on by Crittenden forgot old party divisions, and uniting with Douglas, successfully resisted the Lecompton constitution and sent it back to the people in whose to be by them disposed of at their pleasure. Crittenden, in 1858, as Clay did in 1850, urges his old political associates to sustain Douglas and his associates. But the enemies of Douglas and of Crittenden, by a most unholy alliance, are seeking his defeat, and the defeat of all men who endorse and will sustain his late acts. For this purpose, in the 4th district they are running two candidates—one an abolitionist and the other a Lecompton man and the Whigs of that district—the men who agree with Fillmore and Crittenden—are implored to unite with these allied extremists and send an abolitionist to Congress to war upon Douglas, Crittenden, and all conservative honest men who dare stand up in their places and bid defiance to the fanaticism of the North and of the South. Will the Whigs of Illinois unite to any such alliance? Will they sit quietly by and allow the Lecomptonites and the abolitionists—the two sectional parties—in an allied war upon the men who sustained Clay and Webster in 1850, and fought shoulder to shoulder with Crittenden in 1858 for the sovereign rights of a free people?

The thirty-eight hundred Whigs of the fourth district can decide whether Kellogg, with his abolitionism, shall again misrepresent the people of Illinois, or whether Davidson, the man with the noble heart and stern devotion to the great principles of popular rights shall go there and tell the north and the south that in his district on the banks of the Illinois river, there still exists a body of old line Whigs who, faithful to the memory of the past, faithful to the teachings of Clay, Webster, Choate, Crittenden and Fillmore, have never been, and will never be abolitionised.—The responsibility of the election of an abolitionist is upon you; will you assume it? will you give your voice to sustain Lovejoy and Kellogg, and through their election gratify the men who sought to force slavery upon an unwilling people? Remember well, that the Danite candidate is running only as a tender to Kellogg. He is run to secure, if possible, the election of an abolitionist. You have it in your power to crush both factions to the ground, and to elect a man who, in Congress and out of it, will maintain and defend the constitution and the Union against the abolitionists on the one hand, and the extremists of the south on the other.

THE CAMPAIGN.

DOUGLAS AND LINCOLN AT GALESBURG.

IMMENSE CONCOURSE OF PEOPLE PRESENT.

Upwards of 20,000 on the Ground

GREAT REVOLUTION IN POPULAR SENTIMENT IN KNOX COUNTY.

Black Republicanism beaten in its Stronghold and Outnumbered by the Democracy.

SPLENDID RECEPTION OF SENATOR DOUGLAS.

INTERESTING DEBATE.

LINCOLN AGAIN DEFEATED BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

SPEECHES, INCIDENTS, &c., &c.

The fifth joint debate between Senator Douglas and Mr. Lincoln took place at Galesburg on Thursday last. A larger number of people than have been present on any former occasion were in attendance, from fifteen to twenty thousand being on the ground. The Black Republicans had made every effort to bring out a large crowd, sparing neither money or pains to induce their friends to come out. As early as the 13th of September their committee addressed a private letter to the leading Republicans in various sections of the surrounding country, begging them to bring their people to Galesburg in delegations with flags and banners, but notwithstanding all this drumming, the Democrats outnumbered them almost two to one, and made a much finer demonstration. Senator Douglas arrived in Galesburg at 10 o'clock, and was received by the Galesburg Light Guard, the Scandinavians, a corps composed of our foreign-born citizens, the artillery company of Galesburg, and the Democracy. J. B. Boggs, esq., welcomed him in the following speech:

SENATOR DOUGLAS—To me has been delegated the high honor of bidding you, in the name of the united Democracy of Knox county, a cordial welcome to-day.

We welcome you to-day, not only because you are our favorite Senator from the great State of Illinois, but, sir, our welcome is tendered to you as a great patriot and statesman, [illegible] attached to the institutions of our common country. The Democrats of Knox county are strongly attached to the principle of self-government—that the people are sovereign. And when, during the last winter, they saw you on the floor of the American Senate, laboring with all your energy to uphold the faith of the Democratic party, which had been so unqualifiedly pledged to the great principle of "popular sovereignty," while they saw you doing this, in defiance of the frowns of the administration, when they saw you redeeming the pledges you had so often made, when they saw you standing so nobly by, and upholding with such eloquence the great principles of the "Cincinnati platform," a spirit of renewed admiration for integrity and ability was awakened within them, and while thus battling so gallantly and successfully for our sovereign rights, the patriotic men of all parties sustained you with one voice, and we enter on this idea of November next, as a stronger [illegible] their gratitude and esteem, [illegible] sustain you with their votes. Again, sir, in the name of the Democrats of Knox county, I bid you thrice welcome to this, our young and growing city.

Senator Douglas made an appropriate response, after which the ceremony of the presentation to him of a magnificent banner, beautifully worked by the young ladies of the Lombard University, took place. The presentation was made on behalf of the young ladies by G. W. Elwell, esq.; and, in the course of it, two of the young ladies united their voices with his to complimenting their illustrious visitor. We give their remarks entire:

Mr. Elwell said:

HON. S. A. DOUGLAS—*Respected Sir*: Allow us to present to you this banner in behalf of the Democracy of Lombard University, as a token of our love, friendship, and uncompromising fidelity, with [illegible] emanate from the patriotic hearts of American youth, fired by a love for their ideal of a patriot and statesman. Sir, in you we recognize a bold, fearless champion and defender of those God-like principles of "popular sovereignty"—those principles upon which all our free institutions are based. In you we behold an unconquerable advocate for State rights, and an uncompromising enemy to all who dare raise their puny arm, directly or indirectly, to sever the cords which now bind together this constellation of States, or disregard the sacred compromises of that instrument which our fathers have transmitted to us—the constitution of our country. In you we have a lasting friend to the cause of causes—education, for we are not ignorant of the splendid donation you have made for the establishing of a university in your own city, around the altar of which the minds of American youth may be inspired with the hallowed principles of love, purity, goodness, benevolence, virtue, and patriotism, which will tend to make them a blessing to our nation and the world. We, as students, have in you an example worthy of imitation in your history we see and know what can be accomplished by untiring perseverance and industry. We have seen you commence the battle of life without friends, without pecuniary aid, yet step by step you advance to influence and greatness. First, we see you pleading the cause of liberty and virtue at the bar of our common country,—next, you preside over the courts of our State. We look again, and we behold you standing in the council of the nation, where patriots, ministers and statesmen listen to catch the burning strains of eloquence which fall from your lips, before which tyrants tremble and demagogues sink into their natural littleness. We firmly believe that you have always been true to the interest of this nation. We know that in 1850, when the waves of the turbid waters of disunion rolled up from the South, like a mighty avalanche, and the boisterous rises of fanaticism came down from the North, intent on the same diabolical object—you, with the immortal Clay of the West, and the statesmanlike Webster stood as firm as the "everlasting hills" for the Union, and with your glowing eloquence and convincing logic, commanded the raging elements of the political sea to "be still," and it was so, and soon the lowering clouds sunk to rest, and the bright sun of the Union shone forth with all the pristine beauty from out the governmental heavens, and stars and stripes floated over again in all her accustomed beauty and grace, over a prosperous, happy and satisfied people. Again in 1857 and 1858, when the South wished to force a constitution on Kansas which was not the deed and will of her people, we behold you battling boldly and effectually for the right of the people of the territories to regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States.

Thus have you arisen, and thus have you defended the rights of the people, until it is our candid opinion that you are born to honor—first in honor of race—first in purity of motive—and first in the hearts of the people of the proud State of Illinois.

This banner is a true circle, and represents our idea of your career as Senator and Statesman, which we regard as being one continued round of consistencies.

The blue that encircles it is an emblem of fidelity, and represents our belief in your constancy to principle and the Union. It not only represents our idea of your constancy to principle and the Union, but it is also a pledge to you for our support, and a band of friendship which may never be broken. The white represents our estimation of your honesty, virtue, and patriotism.

The cord which adorns its surface are emblematical of our wish that your future days may be many, happy and prosperous, that as you pass down the rapid stream of time, may the roses of prosperity, virtue, fidelity, purity, love and patriotism, instil their sweetest nectar around your every step.

MISS R. W. MILLER.—As the gentle morning dew drops and the golden rays of the sun unfold the budding rose, and strengthen the growing corn, so the countenance of our Senator heightens our hopes and strengthens our faith in the Union of the States.

MISS H. L. WHEELER.—Like the faithful watchman who stands upon the tower, [illegible] and warns the people within the walls from all approaching danger, so it is with the faithful Senator. He stands at the portals of the nation, and guards the people from all impending danger. This you have done, for this we give you praise, and for this receive this banner.

MR. ELWELL.—And allow me to say, in conclusion, that it is the earnest desire of our souls that you may continue to hold a seat in the councils of this nation until God, in his wisdom, may see fit to call you from the scenes of this world.

Senator Douglas responded with much feeling. The banner was composed of white satin, trimmed with blue, upon which was worked a splendid wreath of flowers. It bore the inscription, "From the Democracy of Lombard University to Stephen A. Douglas." After these interesting ceremonies, Senator Douglas was escorted to the Bonney house, which, from the time of his arrival, was thronged with an immense crowd of people, whilst the streets in front was crowded with processions passing and repassing, filling the air with shouts for Douglas.

Lincoln arrived about twelve o'clock, and was escorted into town by the Republican procession, which numbered about one third the strength of ours, and was a poor thing so far as the display of flags, and banners, and decorations were concerned. If a cheer was proposed for Lincoln, the faint response it called forth was instantly drowned in the overwhelming shout that the Democracy would send up for Douglas, and the Republicans were forced to admit that they were outnumbered and beaten. In 1854 it was as much as a man's life was worth, in Galesburg, to advocate Democratic principles, but now owing to the wonderful change in popular sentiment within the past year or two, Democracy has hosts of friends and supporters in this abolition stronghold, and on Thursday last had possession of the town. The debate was a most interesting one, and we commend it to the careful attention of our readers. Mr Lincoln experienced one of the most complete defeats which he has met during the campaign. His argument was lamentably weak, and as usual, he confined himself to petty personal charges and insinuations against the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, refusing to meet Senator Douglas upon any of the great principles advocated by him. He attempted to pander to the passions and prejudices of his abolition friends by again declaring his predilection for negro equality, and in his rejoinder Senator Douglas took occasion to expose his inconsistencies by comparing these declarations with Lincoln's denunciations of negro equality, and negro citizenship at Jonesboro and Charleston.

The day was a most unpleasant one for speaking in the open air. A strong northwest wind was blowing, which rendered talking difficult, and although the stand was built on the east side of Knox College (the meeting being held in the college grounds), the currents of air which swept around the building rendered it impossible for the speakers at times to make themselves heard at all. Besides this, the cold was intense. Mr. Lincoln, when he mounted the stand, was nervous and trembling, whether from the cold, or through fear of what was in store for him, we are unable to say, but before the close of the debate, he was the most abject picture of wretchedness we have ever witnessed. His knees knocked together, and the chattering of his teeth could be heard all over the stand. When Senator Douglas replied to his charge that he had forged a set of resolutions at Ottawa, he looked pitiful beyond expression, and curled himself up in a corner to avoid facing the bitter denunciation of the Senator, and the scorn and derision with which he was treated by the crowd. The speeches will repay perusal, and we earnestly hope that they will be carefully read by both our friends and opponents. We now proceed to give a correct and faithful report of both parties.

SENATOR DOUGLAS' OPENING SPEECH.

When Senator Douglas appeared on the stand he was greeted with three tremendous cheers. He said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: Four years ago I appeared before the people of Knox county for the purpose of defending my political action upon the compromise measures of 1850 and the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Those of you before me, who were present then, will remember that I vindicated myself for supporting those two measures by the fact that they rested upon the great fundamental principle that the people of each State and each territory of this Union have the right, and ought to be permitted to exercise the right of regulating their own domestic concerns in their own way, subject to no other limitation or restriction than that which the Constitution of the United States imposes upon them. I then called upon the people of Illinois to decide whether that principle of self-government was right or wrong. If it was, and is right, then the compromise measures of 1850 were right, and, consequently, the Kansas and Nebraska bill, based upon the same principle, must necessarily have been right. (That's so, and cheers.)

The Kansas and Nebraska bill declared, in so many words, that it was the true intent and meaning of the act not to legislate slavery into any State or territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. For the last four years I have devoted all my energies, in private and public, to commend that principle to the American people. Whatever else may be said in condemnation or support of my political course, I apprehend that no honest man will doubt the fidelity with which, under all circumstances, I have stood by it.

During the last year a question arose in the Congress of the United States whether or not that principle would be violated by the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton constitution. In my opinion, the attempt to force Kansas in under that constitution was a gross violation of the principle enunciated in the compromise measures of 1850, and Kansas and Nebraska bill of 1854, and therefore I led off in the fight against the Lecompton constitution and conducted it until the effort to carry that constitution through Congress was abandoned. And I can appeal to all men, friends and foes, Democrats and Republicans, Northern men and Southern men, that during the whole of that fight I carried the banner of Popular Sovereignty aloft and never allowed it to trail in the dust, or lowered [illegible] defeated, the question arose in the minds of those who had advocated it what they should next resort to in order to carry out their views. They devised a measure known as the English bill, and granted a general amnesty and political pardon to all men who had fought against the Lecompton constitution, provided they would support that bill. I for one did not choose to accept the pardon or to avail myself of the amnesty granted on that condition. The fact that the supporters of Lecompton were willing to forgive all differences of opinion at that time in the event those who opposed it favored the English bill, was an admission that they did not think that opposition to Lecompton impaired a man's standing in the Democratic party. Now the question arises, what was that English bill which certain men are now attempting to make a test of political orthodoxy in this country. It provided, in substance, that the Lecompton constitution should be sent back to the people of Kansas for their adoption or rejection, at an election which was held in August last, and in case they refused admission under it that Kansas should be kept out of the Union until she had 93,420 inhabitants. I was in favor of sending the constitution back in order to enable the people to say whether or not it was their act and deed, and embodied their will, but the other proposition, that if they refused to come into the Union under it, they should be kept out until they had double or treble the population they then had, I never would sanction by my vote. The reason why I could not sanction it is to be found in the fact that by the English bill, if the people of Kansas had only agreed to become a slaveholding State under the Lecompton constitution, they could have done so with 35,000 people, but if they insisted on being a free State, as they had a right to do, then they were to be punished by being kept out of the Union until they had nearly three times that population. I then said in my place in the Senate, as I now say to you, that whenever Kansas has population enough for a slave State she has population enough for a free State. (That's it, and cheers.) I have never yet given a vote, and I never intend to record one making an odious and unjust distinction between the different States of this Union. (Applause.) I hold it to be a fundamental principle in our republican form of government that all the States of this Union, old and new, free and slave, stand on an exact equality. Equality among the different States is a cardinal principle on which all our institutions rest. Wherever, therefore, you make a discrimination, saying to a slave State that it shall be admitted with 35,000 inhabitants, and to a free State that it shall not be admitted until it has 93,000 or 100,000 inhabitants, you are throwing the whole weight of the federal government into the scale in favor of one class of States against the other. Nor would I on the other hand any sooner sanction the doctrine that a free State could be admitted into the Union with 35,000 people, while a slave State was kept out until it had 93,000. I have always declared in the Senate my willingness, and I am willing now to adopt the rule, that no territory shall ever become a State until it has the requisite population for a member of Congress according to the then existing ratio. But while I have always been, and am now willing to adopt that general rule, I was not willing and would not consent to make an exception of Kansas, as a punishment for her obstinacy, in demanding the right to do as she pleased in the formation of her constitution. It is proper that I should remark here, that my opposition to the Lecompton constitution did not rest upon the peculiar position taken by Kansas on the subject of slavery. I held then, and hold now, that if the people of Kansas want a slave State, it is their right to make one and be received into the Union under it; if, on the contrary, they want a free State, it is their right to have it, and no man should ever oppose their admission because they ask it under the one or the other. I hold to that great principle of self-government which asserts the right of every people to decide for themselves the nature and character of the domestic institutions and fundamental law under which they are to live.

The effort has been and is now being made in this State by certain postmasters and other federal office holders, to make a test of faith on the support of the English bill. These men are now making speeches all over the State against me and in favor of Lincoln, either directly or indirectly, because I would not sanction a discrimination between slave and free States by voting for the English bill. But while that bill is made a test in Illinois for the purpose of breaking up the Democratic organization in this State, how is it in the other States? Go to Indiana, and there you find English himself, the author of the English bill, who is a candidate for re-election to Congress, has been forced by public opinion to abandon his own darling project, and to give a promise that he will vote for the admission of Kansas at once, whenever she forms a constitution in pursuance of law, and ratifies it by a majority vote of her people. Not only is this the case with English himself, but I am informed that every Democratic candidate for Congress in Indiana takes the same ground. Pass to Ohio, and there you find that Groesbeck, and Pendleton, and Cox, and all the other anti-Lecompton men who stood shoulder to shoulder with me against the Lecompton constitution, but voted for the English bill, now repudiate it and take the same ground that I do on that question. So it is with the Joneses and others of Pennsylvania, and so it is with every other Lecompton Democrat in the free States. They now abandon even the English bill, and come back to the true platform which I proclaimed at the time in the Senate, and upon which the Democracy of Illinois now stand. And yet, notwithstanding the fact, that every Lecompton and anti-Lecompton Democrat in the free States has abandoned the English bill, you are told that it is to be made a test upon me, while the power and patronage of the government are all exerted to elect men to Congress in the other States who occupy the same position with reference to it that I do. It seems that my political offence consists in the fact that I first did not vote for the English bill, and thus pledge myself to keep Kansas out of the Union until she has a population of 93,420, and then return home, violate that pledge, repudiate the bill, and take the opposite ground. If I had done this, perhaps the administration would now be advocating my re-election, as it is that of the others who have pursued this course. I did not choose to give that pledge, for the reason that I did not intend to carry out that principle. I never will consent, for the sake of conciliating the frowns of power, to pledge myself to do that which I do not intend to perform. I now submit the question to you as my constituency, whether I was not right, first, in resisting the adoption of the Lecompton constitution, and secondly, in resisting the English bill. (An universal "Yes," from the crowd.) I repeat, that I opposed the Lecompton constitution because it was not the act and deed of the people of Kansas, and did not embody their will. I denied the right of any power on earth, under our system of government, to force a constitution on an unwilling people. (Hear, hear, that's the doctrine and cheers.) There was a time when some men could pretend to believe that the Lecompton constitution embodied the will of the people of Kansas, but that time has passed. The question was referred to the people of Kansas under the English bill last August, and then, at a fair election, they rejected the Lecompton constitution by a vote of from eight to ten against it to one in its favor. Since it has been voted down by so overwhelming a majority, no man can pretend that it was the act and deed of that people. (That's so, and cheers.) I submit the question to you whether or not, if it had not been for me, that constitution would have been crammed down the throats of the people of Kansas against their consent. (It would, it would. Hurra for Douglas; three cheers for Douglas, &c.) While at least ninety-nine out of every hundred people here present agree that I was right in defeating that project, yet my enemies use the fact that I did defeat it by doing right, to break me down and put another man in the U. S. Senate in my place. (No, no, you'll be returned, cheers, &c.) The very men who acknowledge that I was right in defeating Lecompton, now form an alliance with federal office holders, professed Lecompton men, to defeat me, because I did right. (It can't be done.) My political opponent, Mr Lincoln, has no hope on earth, and has never dreamed that he had a chance of success, were it not for the aid he is receiving from federal office holders, who are using their influence and the patronage of the government against me to revenge for my having defeated the Lecompton constitution. (Hear, him, and applause.) What do you Republicans think of a political organization that will try to make an unholy and unnatural combination with its professed foes to beat a man merely because he has done right? (Shame on it.) You know such is the fact with regard to your own party. You know that the axe of decapitation is suspended over every man in office in Illinois, and the terror of proscription is threatened every Democrat by the present administration unless he supports the Republican ticket in preference to my Democratic associates and myself. (The people are with you. Let them threaten, &c.) I could find an instance in the postmaster of the city of Galesburg, and in every other postmaster in this vicinity, all of whom have been stricken down simply because they discharged the duties of their offices honestly, and supported the regular Democratic ticket in this State in the right. The Republican party is availing itself of every unworthy means in the present contest to carry the election, because its leaders know that if they let this chance slip they will never have another, and their hopes of making this a Republican State will be blasted forever.

Now let me ask you whether the country has any interest in sustaining this organization known as the Republican party? That party is unlike all other political organizations in this country. All other parties have been national in their character—have avowed their principles alike in the slave and the free States, in Kentucky as well as in Illinois, in Louisiana as well as in Massachusetts. Such was the case with the old Whig party, and such was and is the case with the Democratic party. Whigs and Democrats could proclaim their principles boldly and fearlessly in the north and in the south, in the east and in the west, wherever the constitution ruled and the American flag waved over American soil.

But now you have a sectional organization, a party which appeals to the northern section of the Union against the southern, a party which appeals to northern passion, northern pride, northern ambition, and northern prejudices, against southern people, the southern States and southern institutions. The leaders of that party hope that they will be able to unite the northern States in one great sectional party, and inasmuch as the North is the strongest section, that they will thus be enabled to out vote, conquer, govern, and control the South. Hence you find that they now make speeches advocating principles and measures which cannot be defended in any slaveholding State of this Union. Is there a Republican residing in Galesburg who can travel into Kentucky and carry his principles with him across the Ohio? (No.) What Republican from Massachusetts can visit the Old Dominion without leaving his principles behind him when he crosses Mason and Dixon's line? Permit me to say to you in perfect good humor, but in all sincerity, that no political creed is sound which cannot be proclaimed fearlessly in every State of this Union where the Federal Constitution is not the supreme law of the land. ("That's so," and cheers.) Not only is this Republican party unable to proclaim its principles alike in the North and in the South, in the free States and in the slave States, but it cannot even proclaim them in the same forms and give them the same strength and meaning in all parts of the same State. My friend Lincoln finds it extremely difficult to manage a debate in the central part of the State, where there is a mixture of men from the North and the South. In the extreme northern part of Illinois he can proclaim as bold and radical abolitionism as ever Giddings, Lovejoy, or Garrison enunciated, but when he gets down a little further south he claims that he is an old line Whig, (great laughter,) a disciple of Henry Clay. ("Singleton says he defeated Clay's nomination for the Presidency," and cries of "that's so,") and declares that he still adheres to the old line Whig creed, and has nothing whatever to do with Abolitionism, or negro equality, or negro citizenship. ("Hurrah for Douglas.") I once before hinted this of Mr. Lincoln in a public speech, and at Charleston he defied me to show that there was any difference between his speeches in the North and in the South, and that they were not in strict harmony. I will now call your attention to two of them, and you can then say whether you would be apt to believe that the same man ever uttered both. (Laughter and cheers.) In a speech in reply to me at Chicago in July last, Mr. Lincoln, in speaking of the equality of the negro with the white man, used the following language:

"I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why may not another say it does not mean some other man? If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out."

You find that Mr. Lincoln there proposed that if the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, declaring all men to be born equal, did not include the negro and put him on an equality with the white man, that we should take the statute book and tear it out. (Laughter and cheers.) He there took the ground that the negro race is included in the Declaration of Independence as the equal of the white race, and that there could be no such thing as a distinction in the races, making one superior and the other inferior. I read now from the same speech:

"My friends, [he says,] I have detained you about as long as I desire to do, and I have only to say let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position, discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal."

("That's right, &c.)

Yes, I have no doubt that you think it is right, but the Lincoln men down in Coles, Tazewell and Sangamon counties *do not* think it is right. (Immense applause and laughter. Hit him again, &c.) In the conclusion of the same speech, talking to the Chicago Abolitionists he said: "I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created free and equal." (Good, good, shame, &c.) Well, you say good to that, and you are going to vote for Lincoln because he holds that doctrine. ("That's so.") I will not blame you for supporting him on that ground, but I will show you in immediate contrast with that doctrine, what Mr. Lincoln said down in Egypt in order to get votes in that locality where they do not hold to such a doctrine. In a joint discussion between Mr. Lincoln and myself, at Charleston, I think, on the 18th of last month, Mr. Lincoln referring to this subject used the following language:

"I will say then, that I am not nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters of the free negroes, or jurors, or qualifying them to hold office, or having them to marry with white people. I will say in addition, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races, which I suppose will forever forbid the two races living together upon terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, that while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, that I as much as any other man am in favor of the superior position being assigned to the white man."

(Good for Lincoln.)

Fellow-citizens, here you find men hurrahing for Lincoln and saying that he did right, when in one part of the State he stood up for negro equality, and in another part for political effect, discarded the doctrine and declared that there always must be a superior and inferior race. (They're not men. Put them out, &c.) Abolitionists up north are expected and required to vote for Lincoln because he goes for the equality of the races, holding that by the Declaration of Independence the white man and the negro were created equal and endowed by the Divine law with that equality, and down south he tells the old Whigs, the Kentuckians, Virginians, and Tennesseeans, that there is a physical difference in the races, making one superior and the other inferior, and that he is in favor of maintaining the superiority of the white race over the negro. Now, how can you reconcile those two positions of Mr Lincoln. He is to be voted for in the south as a pro-slavery man, and he is to be voted for in the north as an Abolitionist. ("Give it to him." "Hit him again.") Up here he thinks it is all nonsense to talk about a difference between the races, and says that we must "discard all quibbling about this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position." Down south he makes this "quibble" about this race and that race and the other race being inferior as the creed of his party, and declares that the negro can never be elevated to the position of the white man. You find that his political meetings are called by different names in different counties in the State. Here they are called Republican meetings, but in old Tazewell, where Lincoln made a speech last Tuesday, he did not address a *Republican* meeting, but "a grand rally of the *Lincoln men*." (Great laughter.) There are very few Republicans there, because Tazewell county is filled with old Virginians and Kentuckians, all of whom are Whigs or Democrats, and if Mr Lincoln had called an Abolition or Republican meeting there, he would not get many votes. (Laughter.) Go down into Egypt and you find that he and his party are operating under an alias there, which his friend Trumbull has given them, in order that they may cheat the people. When I was down in Monroe county a few weeks ago addressing the people, I saw handbills posted announcing that Mr Trumbull was going to speak in behalf of Lincoln, and what do you think the name of his party was there? Why the "*Free Democracy*." (Great laughter.) Mr. Trumbull and Mr. John Baker were announced to address the Free Democrats of Monroe county, and the bill was signed "Many Free Democrats." The reason that Lincoln and his party adopted the name of "Free Democracy" down there was because Monroe county has always been an old fashioned Democratic county, and hence it was necessary to make the people believe that they were Democrats, sympathized with them, and were fighting for Lincoln as Democrats. (That's it, &c.) Come up to Springfield, where Lincoln now lives and always has lived, and you find that the convention of his party which assembled to nominate candidates for legislature, who are expected to vote for him if elected, dare not adopt the name of Republican, but assembled under the title of "all opposed to the Democracy." (Laughter and cheers.) Thus you find that Mr. Lincoln's creed cannot travel through even one half of the counties of this State, but that it changes its hues and becomes lighter and lighter, as it travels from the extreme North, until it is nearly white, when it reaches the extreme south end of the State. (That's so. It's true, &c.) I ask you, my friends, why cannot Republicans avow their principles alike everywhere? I would despise myself if I thought that I was procuring your votes by concealing my opinions, and by avowing one set of principles in one part of the State, and a different set in another part. If I do not truly and honorably represent your feelings and principles, then I ought not to be your Senator, and I will never conceal my opinions, or modify or change them a hair's breadth in order to get votes. I tell you that this Chicago doctrine of Lincoln's—declaring that the negro and the white man are made equal by the Declaration of Independence and by Divine Providence—is a monstrous heresy. (That's so, and terrific applause.) The signers of the Declaration of Independence never dreamed of the negro when they were writing that document. They referred to white men, to men of European birth and European descent, when they declared the equality of all men. I see a gentleman there in the crowd shaking his head. Let me remind him that when Thomas Jefferson wrote that document he was the owner, and so continued until his death, of a large number of slaves. Did he intend to say in that Declaration that his negro slaves, which he held and treated as property, were created his equals by Divine law, and that he was violating the law of God every day of his life by holding them as slaves? ("No, no.") It must be borne in mind that when that Declaration was put forth every one of the thirteen colonies were slaveholding colonies, and every man who signed that instrument represented a slaveholding constituency. Recollect, also, that no one of them emancipated his slaves, much less put them on an equality with himself, after he signed the Declaration. On the contrary, they all continued to hold their negroes as slaves during the revolutionary war. Now, do you believe—are you willing to have it said—that every man who signed the Declaration of Independence declared the negro his equal, and then was hypocrite enough to continue to hold him as a slave, in violation of what he believed to be the divine law. ("No, no.") And yet when you say that the Declaration of Independence includes the negro, you charge the signers of it with hypocrisy.

I say to you, frankly, that in my opinion this government was made by our fathers on the white basis. It was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and was intended to be administered by white men in all time to come. (That's so, and cheers.) But while I hold that under our constitution and political system the negro is not a citizen, cannot be a citizen, and ought not to be a citizen, it does not follow by any means that he should be a slave. On the contrary it does follow that the negro, as an inferior race, ought to possess every right, every privilege, every immunity which he can safely exercise consistent with the safety of the society in which he lives. (That's so, and cheers.) Humanity requires, and Christianity commands that you shall extend to every inferior being, and every dependent being, all the privileges, immunities and advantages which can be granted to them consistent with the safety of society. If you ask me the nature and extent of these privileges, I answer that that is a question which the people of each State must decide for themselves. (That's it.) Illinois has decided that question for herself. We have said that in this State the negro shall not be a slave, nor shall he be a citizen. Kentucky holds a different doctrine. New York holds one different from either, and Maine one different from all. Virginia, in her policy on this question, differs in many respects from the others, and so on, until there is hardly two States whose policy is exactly alike in regard to the relation of the white man and the negro. Nor can you reconcile them and make them alike. Each State must do as it pleases. Illinois had as much right to adopt the policy which we have on that subject as Kentucky had to adopt a different policy. The great principle of this government is that each State has the right to do as it pleases on all these questions, and no other State, or power on earth has the right to interfere with us, or complain of us merely because our system differs from theirs. In the compromise measures of 1850, Mr. Clay declared that this great principle ought to exist in the territories as well as in the States, and I reasserted his doctrine in the Kansas and Nebraska bill in 1854.

But Mr. Lincoln cannot be made to understand, and those who are determined to vote for him no matter whether he is a pro slavery man in the south and a negro equality advocate in the north, cannot be made to understand how it is that in a territory [illegible] whether I cannot explain it to the satisfaction of all impartial men. Chief Justice Taney has said in his opinion in the Dred Scott case, that a negro slave being property, stands on an equal footing with other property, and that the owner may carry them into United States territory the same as he does other property. (That's so.) Suppose any two of you, neighbors, should conclude to go to Kansas, one carrying $100,000 worth of negro slaves and the other $100,000 worth of mixed merchandise, including quantities of liquors. You both agree that under that decision you may carry your property to Kansas, but when you get it there, the merchant who is possessed of the liquors is met by the Maine liquor law, which prohibits the sale or use of his property, and the owner of the slaves is met by equally unfriendly legislation, which makes his property worthless after he gets it there. What is the right to carry your property into the territory worth to either, when unfriendly legislation in the territory renders it worthless after you get it there? The slaveholder when he gets his slaves there finds that there is no local law to protect him in holding them, no slave code, no police regulation maintaining and supporting him in his right, and he discovers at once that the absence of such friendly legislation excludes his property from the territory, just as irresistibly as if there was a positive constitutional prohibition excluding it. Thus you find it is with any kind of property in a territory, it depends for its protection on the local and municipal law. If the people of a territory want slavery, they make friendly legislation to introduce it, but if they do not want it, they withhold all protection from it, and then it cannot exist there. Such was the view taken on the subject by different Southern men when the Nebraska bill passed. See the speech of Mr. Orr, of South Carolina, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress made at that time, and there you will find this whole doctrine argued out at full length. Read the speeches of other southern congressmen, Senators and Representatives, made in 1854, and you will find that they took the same view of the subject as Mr. Orr—that slavery could never be forced on a people who did not want it. I hold that in this country there is no power on the face of the globe that can force any institution on an unwilling people. The great fundamental principle of our government is that the people of each State and each territory shall be left perfectly free to decide for themselves what shall be the nature and character of their institutions. When this government was made, it was based on that principle. At the time of its formation there were twelve slaveholding States and one free State in this Union. Suppose this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln and the Republicans, of uniformity of the laws of all the States on the subject of slavery, had prevailed, suppose Mr Lincoln himself had been a member of the convention which framed the constitution, and that he had risen in that august body, and addressing the father of his country, had said as he did at Springfield:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

What do you think would have been the result? (Hurrah for Douglas.) Suppose he had made that convention believe that doctrine and they had acted upon it, what do you think would have been the result? Do you believe that the one free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus abolished slavery? (No! no! and cheers.) On the contrary, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one free State, and under his doctrine have fastened slavery by an irrevocable constitutional provision upon every inch of the American Republic. Thus you see that the doctrine he now advocates, if proclaimed at the beginning of the government, would have established slavery everywhere throughout the American continent, and are you willing, now that we have the majority section, to exercise a power which we never would have submitted to when we were in the minority? ("No, no," and great applause.) If the Southern States had attempted to control our institutions, and make the States all slave when they had the power, I ask would you have submitted to it? If you would not, are you willing now that we have become the strongest under that great principle of self-government that allows each State to do as it pleases—to attempt to control the Southern institutions? ("No, no.") Then, my friends, I say to you that there is but one path of peace in this republic, and that is to administer this government as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, allowing each State to decide for itself whether it wants slavery or not. If Illinois will settle the slavery question for herself, mind her own business and let her neighbors alone, we will be at peace with Kentucky, and every other Southern State. If every other State in the Union will do the same there will be peace between the North and the South, and in the whole Union.

I am told that my time has expired. (Nine cheers for Douglas.)

LINCOLN'S REMARKS.

Mr. Lincoln, upon advancing to the front of the stand, was received with three cheers. He proceeded to say:

My Fellow Citizens: A very large portion of the speech which Judge Douglas has addressed to you has previously been delivered and put in print. (Laughter.) I do not mean that for a hit upon the Judge at all. If not interrupted, I was going on to say that such an answer as I was able to make to a very large portion of it, had already been once made and put in print, and there is an opportunity already afforded—an opportunity has already been afforded, to see our respective views upon a large portion of the speech which has now been addressed to you.

I make these remarks for the purpose of excusing myself for not passing over the entire ground that he has gone over. I however desire to take some of the points that he has attended to, and ask your attention to them. I shall follow back upon some notes that I have taken, instead of beginning at the head and following them down.

[illegible] has alluded to the Declaration of Independence, and insisted that negroes are not included in it, and that it is a slander upon the framers of that instrument to suppose that negroes were meant therein, and he asks you: Is it possible to believe that Mr. Jefferson, who penned the immortal paper, could have supposed himself applying the language of that instrument to the negro race, and yet held a portion of that race in slavery, and not at once have freed them? I have only to remark upon this point, briefly, for I shall not detain you or myself upon it, that I believe the entire records of the world from the date of the Declaration of Independence up to within three years ago, may be searched in vain for one single declaration from one single man, that the negro was not included in the Declaration of Independence. I think I may defy Judge Douglas to show that he ever said so, therefore, I think I may defy Douglas to show that any President ever said so—that any member of Congress ever said so—that any man ever said so until the necessities of the Democratic party had to invent that declaration. (Applause.) And I will remind Judge Douglas and this audience, that while Mr. Jefferson was the owner of slaves, as undoubtedly he was, speaking on this very subject, he used the strong language that he trembled for his country, when he remembered that God was just. I will offer the highest premium in my power to Judge Douglas, if he will show that he, in all his life, has ever uttered a sentiment akin to that sentiment of Jefferson's. (Applause.)

Another thing I will ask your attention to is the Judge's comments upon the fact, as he assumes it to be, that the Republicans cannot call their public meetings as Republican meetings throughout the State. He instances Tazewell county as one of the places where the friends of Lincoln have called a meeting and have not dared to call it a Republican meeting; and he instances Monroe county, where Trumbull and John Baker addressed a meeting calling themselves the free Democracy. I have the honor to inform Judge Douglas that he spoke in that very county of Tazewell last Saturday, and I was there on Tuesday last, and when he spoke there he spoke under a call not venturing to call the meeting Democratic. (Applause.) Now, Judge, what do you think of yourself? (Laughter, and cries of "Hurrah for Douglas.")

So again, there is another thing that I would ask the Judge's attention to upon that subject. In the contest of 1856 his party delighted to call themselves together as the National Democracy, but now, if there should be a notice put up anywhere for a meeting of the National Democracy, Judge Douglas and his friends would not go there. They would not suppose themselves invited. They would understand it to be a call of those hateful postmasters. (Applause, and say of "A call of your allies, you mean.")

Now, then, a few words in regard to these extracts of speeches of mine, which Judge Douglas has read, and which he supposes are in great contrast, the one with the other. They have been before the public for a long while, and if they be inconsistent as to them the public has been able to detect them. The Judge assumes—when he says that I make speeches of one sort for the North and of another sort for the South—he assumes that I do not understand that my speeches will be put in print. Now I have understood that the speeches that I made at Chicago, at Jonesboro' and at Charleston, would be put in print, and that all reading men might read them, and I have not at all supposed—I do not to-day suppose—that there is any conflict in them. The Judge will bear it in mind that there is a sort of inequality between the black and the white people, that it is nonsense to make slaves of the black. But we must make wives of them. Now, I have all the while made a wide distinction between this. He, perhaps, by taking two parts of the same speech might show a great contrast as he does here. I have all the while maintained that inasmuch or there is a physical inequality between the white and black, that the blacks must remain inferior, but I have always maintained that in the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they were our equals, and this declaration I have constantly made with reference to the abstract moral question which I suppose to be the proper question to consider, when we are legislating about a new country which is not at all ready to be [illegible] with the actual presence of slavery. I have insisted that in legislating for a new country where slavery does not exist, there is no just rule other than that of pure morality and pure abstract right, and with reference to legislating with regard to these new countries, this abstract maxim, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are the first rules to be considered and referred to.

Now, there is no misunderstanding this except by men that are interested in misunderstanding. I have to leave it to a reading community to judge whether I advocate just views, or whether I state views that are revolutionary or hypocritical. I believe myself guilty of no such thing as the latter, and of course I cannot claim that I am entirely free from error in the views and principles that I advance.

The Judge has also detained us a while in regard to the distinction between his party and our party, his as he assumes being a national party and ours a sectional one. He does this in asking the question of whether the country has any interest in maintaining the Republican party. He assumes that party to be altogether sectional and that the party to which he adheres is national, and the argument is, that no party can be a rightful party that cannot announce its principles everywhere. Now, it is the first time, I believe, that I have ever heard it announced as being true, that a man should always announce rightful principles everywhere. I presume that Judge Douglas could not go into Russia and announce the doctrine of our national Democracy—he could not go there and denounce the doctrine of kings, emperors and monarchs, and it may be true in this country that we may not be able to announce a doctrine which is as clearly true as the truth of the Democracy, because of a sentiment so directly opposite to it that will not tolerate our doing so. Is it a true test of a doctrine that in some places people will not let you preach it? Is that so? I understand that a year or two ago the people of Chicago would not let Judge Douglas preach a certain doctrine! I commend it to his consideration whether he takes that as a test of the soundness of what he wanted to preach.

But there is another thing that I wish to ask your attention to in this connection. What is all this evidence that has been brought forward to prove that the Republican party is a sectional party? The main piece of evidence is that in the Southern States the people would not let the people preach our doctrines; that they have no supporters, or substantially no supporters in the slave States. They have not taken hold of our principles as we announce them, nor has the Judge, now. We have a Republican platform laid down in Springfield in June last. We are now far advanced in this canvas. Judge Douglas and I have made, perhaps, forty speeches apiece, we have now met for the fifth time, face to face in debate, and up to this time I have not found Judge Douglas, or any one of his friends, laying his finger upon any one part of the Republican platform, and showing that it is wrong. I ask Republicans to remember this! Judge Douglas turns away from that task. Now, if he had great confidence that our principles are wrong, he would take hold of them and prove them to be so, but, instead of that, he takes hold of the fact that there are people somewhere that will not allow us to preach our doctrines to them as if that were the way to prove them to be wrong.

I ask the Judge's attention to another fact, that by his rule of universality he is last becoming sectional too. I ask his attention to the fact that his speeches will not go so current South as they have heretofore gone. I ask your attention to the fact that he felicitates himself on the fact that the entire Democratic party of the free States are with him. If he has not thought of it I commend to him the evidence in his own declaration of his becoming sectional too. I see the day rapidly approaching, whatever the result of this ephemeral contest may be between Judge Douglas and myself—I see the day fast approaching when his epithets that he has been cramming down Republican throats, will be crammed down his throat.

In regard to what Judge Douglas has said about the establishment of the compromise of 1850, which was the beginning of his speech, being the principles of the Nebraska bill, although I have often presented my views upon that subject before in this canvas, yet if you please I will detain you a little while on that.

Now, I have always maintained so far as I have been able to do, that there was nothing in the Nebraska bill of the principle of the compromise measures of 1850—that in nothing could you find the principles of the compromise of 1850 in the Nebraska bill. If anywhere you would find it in the two pieces of the compromise measures organizing the territories of Utah and New Mexico. It was expressly provided in those two acts, that when they came into the Union they should be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, according as they should choose under their constitution, and nothing was said as to what was to be done as to slavery during their existence as a territory, and Mr Clay constantly gave his opinion that the old Mexican law would govern that question during their existence as territories, and that the old Mexican law excluded slavery. Now, how can it be said that during the territorial existence, as well as at the time of forming a constitution, the people might have slavery. I am not discussing whether it is right or wrong, but there was more than that, that they were all the [illegible] to the Nebraska bill. I maintain that the organization of the territories of Utah and New Mexico did not establish a general principle at all, it had no feature of establishing a general principle for all—they were parts of a compromise—they did not lay down what was proposed as a system for the organization of territories, but they were put in that shape because in another way—allowing them to go in that shape—they were paid for. Consider that that system of compromise measures included, if not quite, nearly half a dozen acts. It included the admission of California as a free State, which was kept out of the Union for half a year because it had formed a free constitution. It included the fixing of the boundary of Texas, which was a slavery question, because if you fixed it further west you made more slave territory, and if you fixed it further east you made more free territory. It included the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and it included the passage of the new fugitive slave law. All these things were put together and although passed in separate acts as they were, they were nevertheless, as the speeches made upon them will show, made to depend the one on the other, and by this system of compromise, which gave name to the system of measures, these two bills for the organization of Utah and New Mexico were passed, and for that reason, as I say, they could not be taken as models to be used in the organization of new territories. I have no evidence of this as I think that Judge Douglas, when he first introduced a bill a year after for the purpose of organizing new territory, did not attempt to follow the New Mexico and Utah bills, and when he introduced the Nebraska bill he did not attempt to follow them. My opinion is, that a thorough investigation will show plainly, first, that the Utah and New Mexico bills were one part of the compromise measures, and never intended as patterns for new bills, and if they were, this Nebraska bill don't follow them at all.

The Judge tells us in proceeding that he is opposed to making an odious distinction between the free and slave States. I am altogether unaware that the Republicans are in favor of making any odious distinction between the free and the slave States; but there is still a difference, as I think, between Judge Douglas and the Republicans in this vicinity of thought. For instance—(here some man running off to some rods kind of a hubbub in the vicinity of the crowd.) Well, that is very beautiful—I suppose that the real difference between Judge Douglas and his friends, on the one side, and the Republicans on the other hand is, that the Judge is not in favor of making any difference between slavery and liberty, that he is in favor of eradicating, [illegible] every light of freedom out of view, and out of existence, all preference for free over slave institutions, and, consequently, every sentiment that he utters, discards the idea that he is against slavery, every sentiment that emanates from him discards the idea that there is any wrong in slavery. Every thought that he utters will be seen to exclude the thought that there is anything wrong in slavery. If you will take his speeches and get the short points—sentiments expressed by him, that he does not care if slavery is voted up, or voted down, and such like, you will see at once it is a perfectly logical idea if you admit that slavery is not wrong, but if it is wrong, Judge Douglas cannot say that he don't care for a wrong being voted up. Judge Douglas declares that if any community wants slavery they can have it. He can logically say that, if he admits that there is no wrong in it, but he cannot say that, if he admits that there is wrong in it. He insists, upon the score of equality, that the owner of slaves and the owner of horses should be allowed to take them alike to new territory and hold them there. That is perfectly logical if the species of property is perfectly alike, but if you admit that one of them is wrong, then you cannot admit any equality between right and wrong. I believe that slavery is wrong, and in a policy springing from that belief that looks to the prevention of the enlargement of that wrong, and that looks at some time to there being an end of that wrong.—The other sentiment is, that it is no wrong, and the policy springing from it that there is no wrong in its becoming bigger, and that there never will be any end of it. There is the difference between Judge Douglas and his friends and the Republican party.

I confess myself as belonging to that class in the country that believe slavery to be a moral and political wrong. I feel, having regard to all constitutional guards thrown around it, that I do never [illegible] desire a policy that shall prevent the enlargement of it. I do look to that point of time when it shall come to an end.

Judge Douglas has gone over [illegible], I believe, the fifth time in my presence—[illegible] the assault—in creating his charge of conspiracy or combination between the National Democracy and Republicans. What evidence Judge Douglas has upon that subject I know not, inasmuch as he never favors us with any. I have said upon former occasions, and I do not choose to suppress it now, that I have no objection to the division in the Judge's party. He got it up himself, it was all his and their work. The Judge had, I think, a great deal more to do with the steps that led to the Lecompton constitution than Mr. Buchanan had, and after they reached it, they quarreled over it, and somewhat divided over it. I am free to confess that I have no objection to the division, but I defy the Judge to show that I have in any way promoted that division, unless he insists upon bringing it upon himself. I challenge all the friends of Judge Douglas here to understand the views of the Republicans in regard to that division. [illegible] remember, two years ago that the opponents of the Democracy were divided between Fremont and Fillmore! Now, any Democrat here will remember that he was glad of it, and that he will have the article then, that there had been [illegible] the Republicans and Americans—that [illegible] of it. Were any glad of the division? [illegible] the Judge does continue [illegible] that there is so unholy and unnatural alliance between the National Democrats and the Republicans, I want to enter my protest against the Judge being received as an entirely competent witness on that subject.

I want to call to the Judge's attention an attack he made upon me in the first one of these debates, at Ottawa, on the 21st of August. I think it was. In order to fix extreme abolitionism upon me, Judge Douglas read a set of resolutions which he declared had been passed by a Republican State convention held in October, 1854, at Springfield, Illinois, and that I had [illegible] but taken part in that convention. It turned out that, although a few men calling themselves an anti-Nebraska State Convention, had met in Springfield about that time, that neither I took any part in it, nor did it pass the resolutions, nor any such resolutions as Judge Douglas read. So apparent did it become that the resolutions that he read had not been passed at Springfield at all, nor by a State convention anywhere, nor by any convention of any sort in which I had taken any part, that seven days afterwards at Freeport, Judge Douglas arose up, and declared that he had been misled by Charles Lanphier, editor of the *Illinois State Register*, and Thomas L. Harris, member of Congress in that district, and he promised that when he went to Springfield he would investigate the matter. Since then, Judge Douglas has been to Springfield, and I presume has made the investigation, but although a month has passed since he has been there, so far as I know he has made no report of the result of his investigation. I have waited as I think long enough for a report upon that investigation. I can, some certainly, [illegible] and hear whether the fraud—the absolute forgery—was committed, and the perpetration of it was clearly traced to the three, Lanphier, Harris, and Douglas; or whether it can be shown in any way to be in [illegible]. That is what Judge Douglas' report would probably show.

It is true that the resolutions read by the Judge were published in the Illinois *State Register* on the 16th of October, 1854, as being the resolutions of [illegible] the publication in the *Register* was a forgery then. The question is still behind which of the three, if it was not by all, committed that forgery? The idea that it was done by mistake is absurd. The article in the Illinois *State Register* contains part of the real proceedings of that Springfield convention, showing that the writer of the article had the real proceedings before him, and purposely threw out the genuine resolutions passed by that convention and fraudulently substituted the others. Lanphier then, as now, was the editor of the *Register*, so that there would seem to be but little room for his escape, but then, it is to be borne in mind, that Lanphier had less interest in the object of that forgery than either of the other two. The immediate object of that forgery at that time was to beat Yates and elect Harris to Congress, and that object was known to be exceedingly dear to Judge Douglas at that time. Harris and Douglas were both in Springfield when that convention was in session, and, although they both left before the fraud appeared in the *Register*, subsequent events show that they both had their eyes constantly fixed upon that convention. The fraud having been apparently successful upon that occasion, both Harris and Douglas have more than once been attempting to put it to new uses, as the woman said when her husband's body was brought home full of eels, and she was asked what should be done with him, she said take the eels out and set him again, and so Harris and Douglas have shown a disposition to take the eels out of that stale fraud by the first election, and set that fraud again more than once. On the 9th of July, 1856, Douglas attempted the repetition of it upon the floor of the United States Senate, upon Trumbull, as will appear in the appendix of the *Congressional Globe* for that year. Later, Harris tried it upon Norton, as will appear from the *Congressional Globe*, and on the 21st of August, all three, Lanphier, Harris, and Douglas attempted it again upon me at Ottawa. It has been clung to, and played again and again as an exceedingly high trump by this blessed trio. Now, that it has been discovered publicly to be a fraud, why we find that Judge Douglas manifests no surprise at it at all. He makes no complaint of Lanphier, who must have known it to be a fraud from the beginning. Both he, and Lanphier, and Harris are just as cozy now, just as active in the concoction of new schemes as they were before the general discovery of this fraud. All this is very natural, if they are all alike guilty of that fraud, and it is very unnatural if any one of them is innocent. Lanphier, perhaps, insists that the rule of honor among thieves does not quite require him to take it all upon himself, and consequently my friend Douglas finds it difficult to make a satisfactory report upon his investigation, but, meanwhile, the three are all glad that each is a most honorable man. Douglas requires an endorsement of his truth and honor by a re-election to the United States Senate, and he makes and repeats against me and against Judge Trumbull, day after day, charges which we know to be utterly untrue, without seeming to think it is a matter that this unexplained fraud will be the least drawback to his claim to be believed. Harris ditto. Harris asks a re-election to the lower house without seeming to remember that he is in this fraud, and the Springfield organ, then, as now, the central organ of both Harris and Douglas, continues to make assertions without thinking at all that its assertions are at all lacking in title to belief.

After all, the subject of the fraud recurs, how did that fraud get into the *State Register*. Lanphier then, as now, was the editor of that paper. Lanphier knows. Lanphier cannot be ignorant of how and by whom it was originally concocted. It may be true that Lanphier insists that the two men for whose benefit it was concocted shall at least bear their share of it. How that is I do not know, but while it remains unexplained, after the express promise of Judge Douglas to investigate it, I hope I may be pardoned if I insist that Judge Douglas' making charges against me and against Judge Trumbull is not quite sufficient evidence of their truth.

While we were at Freeport, in one of these joint discussions, I answered certain interrogatories that Judge Douglas had propounded to me, and then in turn I propounded some to him, which he, in a sort of a way, at least as to some of them, answered. The third one of these interrogatories I have with me. I wish now to make some comments upon it. It was in these words: "If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that States can not exclude slavery from their limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adopting, and following such decision as a rule of political action." To this interrogatory, Judge Douglas made no answer in any just sense of the word. He contented himself with sneering at the thought that it was impossible for the Supreme Court to ever make such a decision, and sneering at me for propounding the interrogatory. I did not propound it without some reflection, and I wish now to address to this audience some remarks upon it. In the second section of the sixth article, I believe it is, of the Constitution of the United States, we find the following language: "This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." The essence of the Dred Scott decision is compressed into the sentence which I will now read: "Now, as we have already said, in an earlier part of this opinion, upon a different point, the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution." The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution. What is affirmed in the constitution? Made firm in the constitution—so made that it cannot be separated from the constitution without breaking the constitution—durable as the constitution—a part of the constitution. Now remember, the provision of the constitution which I have read affirming that that instrument is the supreme law of the land, and that the judges of every State shall be bound by it, any law or constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding, and

that the right of property in a slave is affirmed in it, is made firm in it, cannot be separated without breaking it, durable as the instrument, part of the instrument. What follows as a short and even syllogistic argument from that? I think that it follows, and I submit to the consideration of men capable of arguing, whether, as I state the argument, it has any fault in it. Nothing in the law of any State can destroy a right distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution of the United States—the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution of the United States—therefore nothing in the constitution or laws of any State can destroy the right of property in a slave. I believe that no fault can be pointed out in that argument. Assume the truth of the premises, and the conclusion, so far as I have capacity at all to understand it, the conclusion follows inevitably. There is a fault in it, as I think, but the fault is not in the reasoning, but the fault is the falsehood in fact of one of the premises. I believe that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution, but Judge Douglas thinks it is. I believe that the Supreme Court of the United States, and the advocates of that decision may search in vain for the place in the constitution where the right of property is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution. As I say, therefore, that I think that one of the premises is not true in fact, but it is true with Judge Douglas, it is true that the Supreme Court who pronounced it, they being estopped to deny it, and they being estopped to deny it, the syllogism follows that the Constitution of the United States, being the supreme law, no constitution or law of a State can interfere with it. It being affirmed in that decision that the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution, the conclusion inevitably follows that no State law or constitution can destroy that right. I then say to Judge Douglas, and to all others, that I think it will take a better answer than a sneer to show that those who have said that the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution are not prepared to say that no constitution or law of a State can destroy that right. I believe, I say, that it will take a far better argument than a mere sneer to establish, in the minds of intelligent men, that whoever has said the one will not affirm the other when the public sentiment will justify it. It is but an opinion—the opinion of one very humble man, but it is my opinion that the Dred Scott decision as it is, never would have been made in the form it is if the party that made it had not been sustained previously by the election, and my opinion is that the new Dred Scott decision deciding against the right of the people of States to exclude slavery will never be made if that party is not sustained by the next election, and I believe, further, that it is just as sure to be made as to-morrow is to come, if that party is sustained by the election.

I have said, upon a former occasion, and I repeat it now, that the course of argument that Judge Douglas makes—I charge not his motives in it—but the course of argument that he makes day by day is preparing the public mind for that decision. I have asked him again to point out to me the reason for his firm adherence to the Dred Scott decision. I have turned his attention to the fact that Jackson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of Supreme Court decisions; I have asked his attention to the fact that Mr. Jefferson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of Supreme Court decisions—that Mr. Jefferson said that judges are as honest as other men, and not more so, and substantially, that whenever a free people should give up in absolute submission to any department of the government, retaining no appeal from it, that their liberty is gone. I have asked the attention of Judge Douglas to the fact that the Cincinnati platform, upon which he stands, disregards a decision of the Supreme Court in the matter of a United States Bank. I have asked the attention of the Judge to the fact that he once opposed the Supreme Court of this State, his opposition ending in the curious fact of his sitting down on the bench—he getting his name of Judge in that very way. I can get no answer from the Judge on all this. I can get that far in this canvass and no farther. All I can get from him is that all of us who stand by the decision of the Supreme Court are the friends of the constitution, and all you fellows that dare question it in any way, are enemies of the constitution. Now, in this very devoted position, in opposition to all the great political leaders that he has held as great political leaders—now, in this adherence there is something very marked, and there is something very marked in his adherence to it—not adhering to it on its merits, for he does not discuss it at all, but as being obligatory upon every one because of the source whence it comes, as that which no man may gainsay, is another marked feature of it. It makes it in this respect, that it commits him to the next one as firmly as it does to this. As he will not investigate this, so he commits himself to take the next without inquiring whether it is right or wrong, and as he teaches men,—and he has a great power to teach men—he has a great power to make men say it is right if he says so, and because he has that so he is preparing the public mind to take the next, without inquiring whether it is right or wrong. In this, I argue the Judge is most ingeniously and most powerfully preparing the public mind to take that decision when it comes, and not only so, but he is doing it in the other things that he does, in those maxims generally about liberty, in his assertions that he does not care whether slavery be voted up or be voted down, that whoever wants slavery has a right to have it, that upon the principle of equality it has a right to go everywhere. He is also, whether purposely or not, preparing the public mind for making the institution of slavery national. I call to your minds—I repeat again, I don't charge that he means it so—but I call to your minds to inquire if you are to get the abler instrument that you can think of and then set him to work to prepare the public mind, if you can think of a single instrument so capable as Judge Douglas, and one employed in so apt a way to do it.

I have said once before, and I will repeat it now, that when Mr. Clay was once answering an objection to the Colonization Society, that it had a tendency to the ultimate emancipation of slavery, he said that those who would repress all tendency to liberty and ultimate emancipation must do more than put down the benevolent efforts of the Colonization Society, they must "go back to the hour of our own liberty and independence, and muzzle the cannon that thunders its annual joyous return, that they must blow out the moral lights around us, that they must pervert the human soul, and eradicate the human soul and love of liberty, and then, and not till then, they could perpetuate slavery in this country."

I do think, and must repeat it, because I think it—I do think that Judge Douglas and whoever teaches that the negro has no humble share in the Declaration of Independence, is going back to the hour of our own liberty and independence, and so far as in him lies, is muzzling the cannon that thunders its annual joyous return, that he is blowing out the moral lights around us, and perverting the human soul and eradicating from the human soul the love of liberty, and in every possible way, preparing the public mind with his vast influence for making the institution of slavery perpetual and national.

There is, my friends, only one other point to which I will ask your attention in the remaining time that I have, and perhaps I shall not quite occupy the entire time that I have, as that one head may not take me clear through it.

In the interrogatories that Judge Douglas propounded to me at Freeport, there was one in about this language: Are you opposed to the acquisition of any further territory by the United States unless slavery shall first be prohibited therein? I answered that, as I thought, in about this way: That I am not generally opposed to the acquisition of additional territory, and that I should support or oppose a proposition for the acquisition of additional territory according as I might suppose it was or was not calculated to aggravate this slavery question among us. I then propounded to Judge Douglas another interrogatory, which was co-relative to that, "are you in favor of acquiring additional territory in disregard of how it may affect us upon the slavery question?" Judge Douglas answered that is his way of answering, and I believe that although he took a good many words to answer it, it was a little more fully answered than any other. The substance of it was that this country must continue to expand, that it would need additional territory, that it was as absurd to suppose that we could continue upon our present territory, enlarging in population as we are, as it would be to hoop a boy of twelve years, I believe it was, and expect him to grow to man's growth, and that consequently he was in favor of the acquisition of territory as fast as we would need it, in disregard of how it would affect the slavery question. I don't say that this is his exact language, but that he would leave the question of slavery to be settled by the people of the territory.

A voice,—That is perfectly right.

Mr. Lincoln,—May be it is, let us consider it awhile. This will probably, in the run of things, become one of the concrete manifestations of this slavery question. If Judge Douglas, upon this slavery question succeeds and gets all opposition fairly laid down so that it ceases, the next thing he goes for grabbing Mexico and Central America, and the adjoining islands, each one of which promises additional slave field, and it is to be left to the people that we get to settle the question of slavery in them. When we get Mexico, I don't know that the Judge will have a desire to let them settle that question for themselves, for the Judge has a great horror of mongrels, and I understand that not more than one out of eight are white. I don't know, but I don't suppose he is in favor of those mongrels settling this question, which would bring him somewhat in collision with this inferior race.

It is to be remembered that this power of acquiring additional territory is a power confided to the President and Senate of the United States—that is, the power is not in the control of the representatives of the people any further than they—the President and Senate—can be considered as the representatives of the people. Let me illustrate that a little. When we acquired territory from Mexico, in the Mexican war, the House of Representatives—the immediate representatives of the people—all the time insisted that the territory thus to be acquired should be acquired upon condition that slavery should be forever prohibited therein, in the terms and language that slavery had been prohibited in this country that we now inhabit. It was insisted upon constantly, and never failed, that that territory to be acquired should have that prohibition as far as the House of Representatives were concerned, but at last the President and Senate acquired the territory without asking the House of Representatives, and took it without that prohibition. They have that power, without the immediate representatives of the people being able to say anything about it. That furnishes a very powerful and apt means of bringing new territory into the country, and when it is brought into the country it involves us in this slavery agitation. It is, therefore, a very important consideration, I think, for the American people, whether the policy of bringing in an additional territory shall be brought in without considering at all how it will operate upon the Union in reference to this one great disturbing element of the nation. You will bear in mind that it is to be acquired, in the Judge's view, as fast as we need it, and unfortunately, we have only the Judge and his class of men to decide how fast it is needed. We have no certain and apt mode of determining how fast territory is needed for the country. Whoever wants to go filibustering, thinks that territory is needed, whoever wants to extend slavery, thinks that territory is needed. It is just as easy as anything that is capable of demonstration, that territory is wanted, whatever the motive the man may have for wishing the annexation of new territory, it is as easy to say, but it is impossible to prove, that we do not want it.

Now, I think that it is a great question for the people of this nation to consider, whether, in view of the fact, that this slavery question has been the only one that has ever threatened or menaced a dissolution of the Union, that has ever disturbed us in such a way as to make us fear for our own liberty—I say in view of these facts, I think it is an exceedingly important question for this people to consider, whether we shall enter upon a policy of the acquisition of new territory without regard to this question of slavery. The Judge's view has been expressed, and in my answer to his question I have expressed mine. I think it is going to become an important and practical question. Our views are before this public, and I am anxious that they should consider them, and that they should look through and turn them about, and arrive at a just conclusion whether it is not wise in the acquisition of new territory—whether it will do to overlook the one only danger that has ever threatened the perpetuity of the Union, that has ever threatened our own liberty in the country. I say that I think it is extremely important that they should decide before entering upon this policy.

Now, having said the little that I wished to say—the little I desired to say on that head—whether I have occupied the time that I have or not, I will retire. I cannot enter upon any new topic without transcending my time, which I would not do.

Mr. Lincoln gave way, having eleven minutes to spare.

SENATOR DOUGLAS' REPLY.

When Senator Douglas rose to reply to Mr. Lincoln, six cheers were called for in the crowd, and given with great spirit. He said, quieting the applause:

Gentlemen—The highest compliment you can pay me during the brief half hour that I have to conclude is by observing a strict silence. I desire to be heard rather than to be applauded. (Good.)

The first criticism that Mr. Lincoln makes on my speech was that it was in substance what I have said everywhere else in the State where I have addressed the people. I wish I could say the same of his speech. (Good, you have him, and applause.) Why, the reason I complain of him is because he makes one speech north and another south. (That's so.) Because he has one set of sentiments for the abolition counties and another set for the counties opposed to abolitionism. (Hit him over the knuckles.) My point of complaint against him is that I cannot induce him to hold up the same standard, to carry the same flag in all parts of the State. He does not pretend, and no other man will, that I have one set of principles for Galesburg and another for Charleston. (No, no.) He does not pretend that I hold to one doctrine in Chicago and to an opposite one in Jonesboro. I have proved that he has a different set of principles for each of these localities. All I asked of him was that he should deliver the speech that he has made here to-day in Coles county instead of in old Knox. It would have settled the question between us in that doubtful county. Here I understand him to reaffirm the doctrine of negro equality, and to assert that by the Declaration of Independence the negro is declared equal to the white man. He tells you to-day that the negro was included in the Declaration of Independence when it asserted that all men were created equal. ("We believe it.") Very well. (Here an uproar arose, persons in various parts of the crowd indulging in cat calls, groans, cheers, and other noises, preventing the speaker from proceeding.)

MR. DOUGLAS—Gentlemen, I ask you to remember that Mr. Lincoln was listened to respectfully, and I have the right to insist that I shall not be interrupted during my reply.

MR. LINCOLN—I hope that silence will be preserved.

MR. DOUGLAS,—Mr. Lincoln asserts to-day as he did at Chicago, that the negro was included in that clause of the Declaration of Independence which says that all men were created equal and endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Ain't that so?) If the negro was made his equal and mine, if that equality was established by Divine law, and was the negro's inalienable right, how came he to say at Charleston to the Kentuckians residing in that section of our State, that the negro was physically inferior to the white man, belonged to an inferior race, and he was for keeping him always in that inferior condition. (Good.) I wish you to bear these things in mind. At Charleston he said that the negro belonged to an inferior race, and that he was for keeping him in that inferior condition. There he gave the people to understand that there was no moral question involved, because the inferiority being established, it was only a question of degree and not a question of right; here, to-day, instead of making it a question of degree, he makes it a moral question, says that it is a great crime to hold the negro in that inferior condition. (He's right.) Is he right now or was he right in Charleston? (Both.) He is right then, sir, in your estimation, not because he is consistent, but because he can trim his principles any way in any section, so as to secure votes. All I desire of him is that he will declare the same principles in the South that he does in the North.

But did you notice how he answered my position that a man should hold the same doctrines throughout the length and breadth of this republic? He said, "Would Judge Douglas go to Russia and proclaim the same principles he does here?" I would remind him that Russia is not under the American constitution. ("Good," and laughter.) If Russia was a part of the American republic, under our federal constitution, and I was sworn to support that constitution, I would maintain the same doctrine in Russia that I do in Illinois. (Cheers.) The slaveholding States are governed by the same federal constitution as ourselves, and hence a man's principles, in order to be in harmony with the constitution must be the same in the South as they are in the North, the same in the free States as they are in the slave States. Whenever a man advocates one set of principles in one section, and another set in another section, his opinions are in violation of the spirit of the constitution which he has sworn to support. ("That's so.") When Mr. Lincoln went to Congress in 1847, and laying his hand upon the holy evangelists, made a solemn vow in the presence of high Heaven that he would be faithful to the constitution,—what did he mean? the constitution as he expounds it in Galesburg, or the constitution as he expounds it in Charleston? (Cheers.)

[illegible] circumstance of Ottawa I read a [illegible] of resolutions as having been adopted at Springfield, in this State, on the 4th or 5th of October, 1854, which happened not to have been adopted there. He has used hard names, has dared to talk about fraud, (laughter), about forgery, and has insinuated that there was a conspiracy between Mr. Lanphier, Mr. Harris, and myself to perpetrate a forgery. (Renewed laughter.) Now, bear in mind that he does not deny that these resolutions were adopted in a majority of all the Republican counties of this State in that year, he does not deny that they were declared to be the platform of this Republican party in the first Congressional district, in the second, in the third, and in many counties of the fourth, and that they thus became the platform of his party in a majority of the counties upon which he now relies for support, he does not deny the truthfulness of the resolutions, but takes exception to the *spot* on which they were adopted. He takes to himself great merit because he thinks they were not adopted on the right spot for me to use them against him, just as he was very severe in Congress upon the government of his country when he thought that he had discovered that the Mexican war was not begun in the right *spot*, and was therefore unjust. (Renewed laughter.) He tries very hard to make out that there is something very extraordinary in the place where the thing was done, and not in the thing itself. I never believed before that Abraham Lincoln would be guilty of what he has done this day in regard to those resolutions. In the first place, the moment it was intimated to me that they had been adopted at Aurora and Rockford instead of Springfield, I did not wait for him to call my attention to the fact, but led off and explained in my first meeting after the Ottawa debate, what the mistake was, and how it had been made. (That's so.) I supposed that for an honest man, conscious of his own rectitude, that explanation would be sufficient. I did not wait for him, after the mistake was made, to call my attention to it, but frankly explained it at once as an honest man would. (Cheers.) I also gave the authority on which I had stated that these resolutions were adopted by the Springfield Republican convention. That I had seen them quoted by Major Harris in a debate in Congress, as having been adopted by the first Republican State convention in Illinois, and that I had written to him and asked him for the authority as to the time and place of their adoption, that Major Harris being extremely ill, Charles H. Lanphier had written to me for him, that they were adopted at Springfield, on the 5th of October, 1854, and had sent me a copy of the Springfield paper containing them. I read them from the newspaper just as Mr. Lincoln reads the proceedings of meetings held years ago from the newspapers. After giving that explanation, I did not think there was an honest man in the State of Illinois who doubted that I had been led into the error, if it was such, innocently, in the way I detailed; and I will now say that I do not now believe that there is an honest man on the face of the globe who will not regard with abhorrence and disgust Mr. Lincoln's insinuations of my complicity in that forgery, if it was a forgery. (Cheers.) Does Mr. Lincoln wish to push these things to the point of personal difficulties here? I commenced this contest by treating him courteously and kindly, I always spoke of him in words of respect, and in return he has sought, and is now seeking, to divert public attention from the enormity of his revolutionary principles by impeaching men's sincerity and integrity, and inviting personal quarrels. (Give it to him, and cheers.)

I desired to conduct this contest with him like a gentleman, but I spurn the insinuation of complicity and fraud made upon the simple circumstance of an editor of a newspaper having made a mistake as to the place where a thing was done, but not as to the thing itself. These resolutions were the platform of this Republican party of Mr. Lincoln's of that year. They were adopted in a majority of the Republican counties in the State, and when I asked him at Ottawa whether they formed the platform upon which he stood, he did not answer, and I could not get an answer out of him. He then thought, as I thought, that those resolutions were adopted at the Springfield convention, but excused himself by saying that he was not there when they were adopted, but had gone to Tazewell court in order to avoid being present at the convention. He saw them published as having been adopted at Springfield, and so did I, and he knew that if there was a mistake in regard to them, that I had nothing under heaven to do with it. Besides, you find that in all these northern counties where the Republican candidates are running pledged to him, that the conventions which nominated them adopted that identical platform. One cardinal point in that platform which he shrinks from is this—that there shall be no more slave States admitted into the Union, even if the people want them. Lovejoy stands pledged against the admission of any more slave States. (Right, so do we.) So do you, you say. Farnsworth stands pledged against the admission of any more slave States. (Just right.) Washburne stands pledged the same way. (Good, good.) The candidate for the legislature who is running on Lincoln's ticket in Henderson and Warren, stands committed by his vote in the legislature to the same thing, and I am informed, but do not know of the fact, that your candidate here is also so pledged. (Hurrah for him, good.) Now, you Republicans all hurrah for him, and for the doctrine of "no more slave States," and yet Lincoln tells you that his conscience will not permit him to sanction that doctrine. (Immense applause.) And complains because the resolutions I read at Ottawa made him as a member of the party, responsible for sanctioning the doctrine of no more slave States. You are one way, you confess, and he is or pretends to be the other, and yet you are both governed by *principle* in supporting one another. If it be true, as I have shown it is, that the whole Republican party in the northern part of the State stands committed to the doctrine of no more slave States, and that this same doctrine is repudiated by the Republicans in the other part of the State, I wonder whether Mr. Lincoln and his party do not present the case which he cited from the Scriptures, of a house divided against itself which cannot stand! (Tremendous shouts of applause.) I desire to know what are Mr. Lincoln's principles and the principles of his party? I hold, and the party with which I am identified hold, that the people of each State, old and new, have the right to decide the slavery question for themselves, ("That's it," "Right," and immense applause,) and when I used the remark that I did not care whether slavery was voted up or down, I used it in the connection that I was for allowing Kansas to do just as she pleased on the slavery question. I said that I did not care whether they voted slavery up or down, because they had the right to do as they pleased on the question, and therefore my action would not be controlled by any such consideration. (That's the doctrine.) Why cannot Abraham Lincoln, and the party with which he acts, speak out their principles so that they may be understood? Why do they claim to be one thing in one part of the State and another in the other part? Whenever I allude to the abolition doctrines, which he considers a slander to be charged with being in favor of, you all endorse them, and hurrah for them, not knowing that your candidate is ashamed to acknowledge them. (You have them; and cheers.)

I have a few words to say upon the Dred Scott decision, which has troubled the brain of Mr. Lincoln so much. (Laughter.) He insists that that decision would carry slavery into the free States, notwithstanding that the decision says directly the opposite; and goes into a long argument to make you believe that I am in favor of, and would sanction the doctrine that would allow slaves to be brought here and held as slaves contrary to our constitution and laws. Mr. Lincoln knew better when he asserted this, he knew that one newspaper, and so far as is within my knowledge, but one ever asserted that doctrine, and that I was the first man in either House of Congress that read that article in debate, and denounced it on the floor of the Senate as revolutionary. When the Washington *Union*, on the 17th of last November published an article to that effect, I branded it at once, and denounced it, and hence the *Union* has been pursuing me ever since. Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, replied to me, and said that there was not a man in any of the slave States south of the Potomac river that held any such doctrine. Mr. Lincoln knows that there is not a member of the Supreme Court who holds that doctrine; he knows that every one of them, as shown by their opinions, holds the reverse. Why this attempt, then, to bring the Supreme Court into disrepute among the people? It looks as if there was an effort being made to destroy public confidence in the highest judicial tribunal on earth. Suppose he succeeds in destroying public confidence in the court, so that the people will not respect its decisions, but will feel at liberty to disregard them, and resist the laws of the land, what will he have gained? He will have changed the government from one of laws into that of a mob, in which the strong arm of violence will be substituted for the decisions of the courts of justice. ("That's so.") He complains because I did not go into an argument reviewing Chief Justice Taney's opinion, and the other opinions of the different judges, to determine whether their reasoning is right or wrong on the questions of law. What use would that be? He wants to take an appeal from the Supreme Court to this meeting to determine whether the questions of law were decided properly. He is going to appeal from the Supreme Court of the United States to every town meeting in the hope that he can excite a prejudice against that court, and on the wave of that prejudice ride into the Senate of the United States, when he could not get there on his own principles, or his own merits. (Laughter and cheers, "hit him again.") Suppose he should succeed in getting into the Senate of the United States, what then will he have to do with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case? Can he reverse that decision when he gets there? Can he act upon it? Has the Senate any right to reverse or revise it? He will not pretend that it has. Then why drag the matter into this contest, unless for the purpose of making a false issue, by which he can direct public attention from the real issue.

He has cited General Jackson in justification of the war he is making on the decision of the court. Mr. Lincoln misunderstands the history of the country, if he believes there is any parallel in the two cases. It is true that the Supreme Court once decided that if a bank of the United States was a necessary fiscal agent of the government, it was constitutional, and if not, that it was unconstitutional, and also, that whether or not it was necessary for that purpose, was a political question for Congress and not a judicial one for the courts to determine. Hence the court would not determine the bank unconstitutional. Jackson respected the decision, obeyed the law, executed it and carried it into effect during its existence; (that's so,) but after the charter of the bank expired and a proposition was made to create a new bank, General Jackson said, "It is unnecessary, and improper, and therefore, I am against it on constitutional grounds as well as those of expediency." Is Congress bound to pass every act that is constitutional? Why, there are a thousand things that are constitutional, but yet are inexpedient and unnecessary, and you surely would not vote for them merely because you had the right to? And because General Jackson would not do a thing which he had a right to do, but did not deem expedient or proper, Mr. Lincoln is going to justify himself in doing that which he has no right to do. (Laughter.) I ask him, whether he is not bound to respect and obey the decisions of the Supreme Court as well as me? The Constitution has created that Court to decide all constitutional questions in the last resort, and when such decisions have been made, they become the law of the land, (that's so,) and you, and he, and myself, and every other good citizen are bound by them. Yet, he argues that I am bound by their decisions and he is not. He says that their decisions are binding on Democrats, but not on Republicans. (Laughter and applause.) Are not Republicans bound by the laws of the land, as well as Democrats? And when the court has fixed the construction of the constitution on the validity of a given law, is not their decision binding upon Republicans as well as upon Democrats? (It ought to be.) Is it possible that you Republicans have the right to raise your mobs and oppose the laws of the land and the constituted authorities, and yet hold us Democrats bound to obey them? My time is within half a minute of expiring, and all I have to say is, that I stand by the laws of the land. (That's it, hurrah for Douglas.) I stand by the constitution as our fathers made it, by the laws as they are enacted, and by the decisions of the court upon all points within their jurisdiction as they are pronounced by the highest tribunal on earth, and any man who resists these must resort to mob law and violence to overturn the government of laws.

When Senator Douglas concluded, the applause was perfectly furious and overwhelming, he was surrounded by an immense mass of people who accompanied him to his hotel, which, during the whole evening, was thronged with people going and coming to congratulate him upon his great success; whilst Lincoln, entirely forgotten, was taken care of by a few friends, who wrapped him in flannels and tried to restore the circulation of blood in his almost inanimate body. Poor Lincoln! he was not even visible to the friends who came to weep with him.

An Old Whig Answers Mr. Lincoln.

Editors Times,—In the papers of this morning, I notice the following passage in Mr. Lincoln's late speech at Galesburg:

"He (Douglas) has alluded to the Declaration of Independence, and has insisted that negroes are not meant by the term "men" in that Declaration of Independence, and that it is a slander upon the framers of that instrument to suppose that they so meant. He asks you if it is possible to believe that Mr. Jefferson, who penned the Declaration of Independence, would have supposed himself as applying the language of that instrument to the negro race, and yet have held a portion of that negro race in slavery, and not at once have freed them. I have only to remark upon this point, briefly, for I shall not detain you or myself upon it, that I believe the entire records of the world, from the date of the Declaration of Independence up to within three years ago, may be searched in vain for one single declaration from one single man, that the negro was not included in the Declaration of Independence; I think I may defy Douglas to show that he ever said so, therefore, I think I may defy Douglas to show that any President ever said so—that any member of Congress ever said so—that any living man upon the whole earth ever said so, until the necessities of the Democratic party had to invent that declaration."

In reply to this, I append the following extract from the speech of HENRY CLAY, delivered at Richmond, Indiana, October 1, 1842, in reply to a petition presented to him by one Mr. Mendenhall and others, the point in the argument was the same precisely as one made by Mr. Lincoln. The reply was overwhelming and conclusive. I commend the extract, and indeed the whole speech, to the attentive perusal, especially of the old conservative Whig portion of the citizens of our State, who were the devoted adherents and supporters of this wise and patriotic statesman.

Mr. Clay, in the course of his remarks on that occasion, said:

"What is the *foundation* of this appeal to me in Indiana, to liberate the slaves under my care in Kentucky? It is a general declaration in the act announcing to the world the independence of the thirteen American colonies, that *all "men are created equal."* Now, as an abstract principle, there is no doubt of the truth of that declaration, and it is desirable in the original construction of society, and in organized societies, to keep it in view as a great fundamental principle. But then I apprehend that in no society that ever did exist, or ever shall be formed, was or can the equality asserted among the members of the human race be practically enforced and carried out. There are portions of it, large portions, women, minors, insane, culprits, transient sojourners, that will always probably remain subject to the government of another portion of the community.

"That declaration, whatever may be the extent of its import, was made by the delegations of the Thirteen States. In most of them slavery existed, and had long existed, and was established by law. It was introduced and forced upon the colonies by the paramount law of England. Do you believe that in making that declaration the States that concurred in it intended that it should be tortured into a virtual emancipation of all the slaves within their respective limits? Would Virginia and the other Southern States have ever united in a declaration which was to be interpreted into an abolition of slavery among them? Did any one of the Thirteen States entertain such a design or expectation? To impute such a secret and unavowed purpose, would be to charge a political fraud upon the noblest band of patriots that ever assembled in council; a fraud upon the confederacy of the revolution, a fraud upon the union of those States, whose constitution not only recognized the lawfulness of slavery, but permitted the importation of slaves from Africa until the year 1808. And I am bold to say that if the doctrines of ultra political Abolitionists, (meaning, of course, such doctrines as he was then discussing,) had been seriously promulgated at the epoch of our Revolution, our glorious independence would never have been achieved—never, NEVER!"

It seems to me that Mr. Lincoln is answered.

AN OLD LINE WHIG,
But not an Abolitionist.

THE WEEKLY TIMES.

SHEAHAN & PHILIP, Publishers and Proprietors.
JAS. W. SHEAHAN. . . . WILLIAM PRICE.

Chicago Thursday Morning, Oct. 14, 1858.

The Grain Trade of Chicago.

During the last week there have been received at Chicago, 22,150 bbls. Flour, (the largest amount of Flour received in any one week this year,) 358,127 bus. Wheat, 282,902 bu. Corn, 14,979 bus. Oats, and 13,286 bus. Barley, making 776,104 bus. of Grain. The total receipts of the season are now 394,584 bbls. Flour, 8,583,856 bus. Wheat, 8,073,512, bus. Corn, 1,706,[illegible] bus. Oats, and probably 86,000 bus. Barley, making a total of TWENTY MILLIONS OF BUSHELS OF GRAIN, namely, 20,378,668 bushels. At this time last year the receipts were 194,511 bbls. Flour, 5,667,681 bus. Wheat, 5,202,059 bus. Corn, and 816,000 bus. Oats, making 13,474,464 bushels of Grain, and showing an increase in the receipts of this year, of 6,855,204 bushels.

The shipments during the last week have been 21,553 bbls. Flour, 314,346 bus. Wheat, 364,225 bus. Corn, and 10,000 bus. Barley, making 788,336 bus. of Grain. The total shipments of the season are now 322,573 bbls. Flour, 7,167,546 bus. Wheat 7,110,978 bus. Corn, 1,412,000 bus. Oats and 87,008 bus. Barley, making a total of nearly EIGHTEEN MILLIONS OF BUSHELS OF GRAIN, namely 17,741,582 bushels. At this time last year the shipments had amounted to 104,126 bbls. Flour 5,684,184 bus. Wheat, 6,621,287 bus. Corn, and 276,714 bus. Oats, making 13,127,456 bus. of Grain, and showing an increase in the shipments of this year, of 4,771,364 bushels.

During the last week a decline of tenor 4c has taken place on Wheat. The closing prices of yesterday were, for No. 1 white Winter 88c in store; No. 1 red Winter 88a90c. in store, and 61 cents for No. 2 Spring on board.

The cattle and live hog market has been active, but prices have slightly declined. Sales of cattle are made at about $2,50 per 100 lbs., and of live hogs at about $4,00a$4,25 per 100 lbs. live weight, equal to $5,00a$5,50 nett.

Fifth Joint Debate.

We spread before the public, in this number of our paper, the Galesburg debate, which excludes the most of the variety of reading matter usually found in these columns. To a class of patrons the debate will not possess much interest. They are not enough excited by the incidents of the campaign, to enter heartily upon the reading of eight or ten close columns of controversial discourse. We beg each person will exercise patience.

The large majority, however, of our readers, not only in Illinois, but in all the various sections of the United States, will peruse this debate with deep interest and great profit. They can here find the issues of the contest clearly defined, and examine the arguments on either side. They can here learn the facts of the campaign, which cannot be gainsaid nor suppressed. And no Democrat can feel anything but the pride of defiance as he follows Senator Douglas through his compact and magnificent speeches. In the argument, as compared with Lincoln, Senator Douglas moves on with the stately regularity of the noble river which forms Illinois' western boundary, while his competitor frets and foams like the confined shallow waters of a pool that beat with a show of energy the impeding sides, but cannot escape. Douglas is direct, bold and powerful, he knows his positions, understands his adversary, and by every effort advances himself in the judgment and affections of the people. Lincoln limps, equivocates and denies, he does not know his positions—and though he comprehends, is aware he cannot match his opponent. As a consequence, every effort he makes before the people, the deeper involved he is, and the lower in public estimation he sinks. Here we see the difference in the results of an intelligent, manly course, when dealing with an honorable people, and those which follow the opposite course—the course pursued by the enemies of Douglas and Democracy.

We have not the space in this paper for an extended notice of the speeches. Nor is such notice necessary. It is taken for granted the [illegible] upon what they read, and do not depend upon their editors. This is not the case with the Black Republicans, if we may judge from the absurd comments on the several debates in Black Republican papers. But there are points in the debate of which we shall have something to say hereafter. In the meantime, read it, and then hand it to your neighbor.

The speeches are reported verbatim, as the preceding ones have been, and by the same reporters. That of Senator Douglas by Mr. Sheridan, for a long time an equal in Washington and Philadelphia with the most accurate and able of his profession, that of Lincoln by Mr. Binmore, whose qualifications are of a high order.

The Liars at their Work Again.

Any man who ever heard Abraham Lincoln speak, knows that he cannot utter five distinct sentences in succession—knows that his language is inelegant, his sentences distorted, and his whole phraseology so mixed up that it is tenfold more difficult to render what he says in intelligible English than it would be to report what any other speaker would say. Mr. Lincoln knows all this, he has confessed it on the stump, and has regretted that he is not as fluent as his competitor.

When he made his Ottawa speech, we published what he said, literally, and it appeared just as he said it. If that report made him ridiculous it was his misfortune and not the reporter's fault. But, the speech made by him on that occasion was dressed up for him in this city, and of course, when published, was a very different thing from what he uttered and what we published. At that time, the Chicago *Tribune* solemnly declared that it would *prove* that the report of Lincoln's speech as published in the TIMES was a mutilation of the real speech, a mutilation made at the Tremont House by Senator Douglas, the editor of the TIMES, and "two Dred Scott lawyers." We promptly challenged the production of any proof of such an act by either of the parties named, and the lying blackguards who control the *Tribune* have not dared to offer the least evidence. They have had too much experience in the "affidavit" business to enter upon it again. But, wholly neglectful of their past unproved accusations, they boil over, once a fortnight in lamentations over the same old story of Douglas mutilating Lincoln's speeches.

Lincoln's Galesburg speech was written out in Chicago, on Friday, Oct. 8, and on that day Douglas was speaking at Macomb, McDonough county, and yet these petty knaves of the *Tribune* use the following language:

"There are to be two more discussions, and we presume that on the part of Douglas and the *Times*, the same system of garbling and misprinting Lincoln's speeches will be persisted in to the end of the chapter. The same scoundrelly means will be continued to break the force of Lincoln's blows before they reach the Douglas worshippers."

Again, we brand the author of these allegations, be his name what it may, as a liar and a scoundrel.

Not a Danite.

Timothy Kelly, merchant of Joliet, writes us that he is not a Danite, but is, as he always has been, a Democrat, and requests us to deny the rumor put afloat by a Danite organ of a contrary import. His name was used, without authority, by a little convention of bolters, a short time since—and then it was published in various papers that he had "abandoned Douglas."

This is one of the Danite and Lincolnite conversions that are occasionally made a boast of in the allied papers—and if followed up they would all turn out as this does. The conversions are all from the alliance and Lincoln to the Democracy and Douglas.

Mr. Kelly offers $50 for the name of the person who first procured the publication of his name in the connexion complained of.

☞ The Boston *Courier* one of the best journals in New England, and conducted with marked taste and ability has commenced the issue of an evening edition. It is to contain less political matter and more miscellaneous reading than the morning paper.

☞ The result of the Connecticut town elections shows that the towns are about equally divided between the Democrats and Republicans. In Bridgeport the Democrats have gained 350 votes since the April election.

Rights of Slave Property in the Territories—Mr. Douglas' Position.

We reproduce, on the first page of this morning's TIMES, an able and timely editorial article from the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*, discussing the questions that have been started by the enemies of Senator Douglas since his speech at Freeport, relative to the rights of slave property in the Territories. The reader of it—and we trust every one into whose hands this paper shall fall, will read it—will not detect much, either in the positions taken by the writer, in his argument, or in the number, character and arrangement of the quotations, that is new,—we having been repeatedly through the whole case. But it is significant that the South, at least that the leading organs of southern sentiment so fully fall in with the views on these questions expressed by the true Democracy of the North, and so earnestly enter the lists to defend the principles involved, against all assailants, and at every hazard.

The public, when the proper light has been disseminated, cannot fail to see that the Democratic party, in spite of occasional indiscretions of friends, and hostile acts of both secret and open foes, is still firmly united in action, and harmonious in sentiment.

And we wish it specially remarked that, while the leagued Lincoln and Danite organs are busily employed by their masters respectively in casting discredit on Democratic principles, impugning the integrity of a leading Democratic statesman—which employment is based on the slanderous assertion that Senator Douglas, by correctly interpreting the Dred Scott decision and reconciling its effects with the legitimate workings of the principle of popular sovereignty, has repudiated the decision and unduly exalted his principle—we wish it specially remarked, we say, that while all this is going on, here in a non-slaveholding State, to the manifest disadvantage of free institutions, the leading champions of Democracy in the South come up boldly to the rescue.

Under the clear and forcible logic of Senator Douglas, when handling this question, the Republicans vowed, they could find no fault and could wage no war with the Democracy, if Senator Douglas' platform should be still held as the Democratic platform. They resolved, therefore, to turn round and accuse him and the party he leads of having deserted the Democracy—of having repudiated the Dred Scott decision.

We then in vain looked into the Republican newspapers for denunciations of the Dred Scott decision—all their philippics were suddenly directed to Douglas, who had, according to them, attempted to intercept the force and extent of that decision. This turn was approved by the Danites, who must, or wofully embarrass their masters, sustain the decision, and between whom and the Republicans this one point of difference was the only one; this point removed, all would be harmony in their ranks and nobody at Washington could be offended. On this basis the "happy family" conducted their affairs until it became evident that the game which was the object of their pursuit, and of course the exciting cause of all their duplicity, treachery and corruption, was rapidly moving out of their sight. We beg the reader's patience through this brief review—as it is important to keep an eye on all these features of the contest. There are in every school district of the State men who can testify that the tactics of the Republicans last described, worked to the decided advantage of the Democracy. Honest free soilers concluded that, as Lincoln was not committed to any definite action with reference to the Dred Scott decision—in one section declaring that he would not submit to it, and in other sections protesting that he would submit to it,—and as he and the newspapers which support him charged Senator Douglas with attempts to evade the decision, they had no inducement to advocate the election of Lincoln and no motive to seek to defeat Douglas. Was not this so? We have hundreds of letters, of various dates, from all parts of the State, which authorize this view, and we have the evidence at hand of the fact that hundreds—perhaps thousands—of this class of voters have permanently separated themselves from the Republican party. [illegible] they did, without too great a prostitution, and cannot be drawn into these associations again. Indeed, they cannot return to the disgraced standard of Lincoln, no more than the Americans and Whigs in Illinois can train under his tattered and sightless flag.

And whilst the natural opponents of the Democracy are thus detached from the Republican party, no member of the Democratic party finds any excuse or has any desire to break up his old affinities. So that this cunning scheme, as the allies thought it, but bungling and ludicrous scheme, as it has proved—of unhitching from the anti-Supreme Court decision nag, and mounting the opposite hobby—is incapable of damaging any body save the allies themselves. The Black Republicans in vain charge Senator Douglas with dishonestly interpreting the Dred Scott decision—for they have until latterly denied that the decision was just, and announced a purpose to nullify it. The Danites adopt and commend the exposition of the decision, as made by the Washington *Union*, without avail or effect—for the people know that Congress, nor the Supreme Court, nor the President, has any power to compel the people of the territories to have slavery if they do not want it. Hence the people, Douglas occupying the true position on this question, are with him. All men who have positive and intelligent ideas, are forced to be with him,—for, on the one hand, we have a party who has threatened to nullify the decision of the highest and most august tribunal in the land, and suppresses those threats, now, and until after election, only in obedience to a mistaken policy, and on the other hand we have a party, or rather a miserable faction, who advocate the doctrine, for which they pretend to find authority in the Dred Scott decision, that territorial legislatures may be compelled by Congress to invite slavery into their jurisdictions, and to foster it there by a special slave code! Between these two ultra parties, and opposed to both of them as leagued enemies, is the Democratic party, whose position is just and impregnable.

We began writing in the vein of the foregoing, particularly to direct attention to the abovementioned article from the Richmond *Enquirer*, and as a preface to an article upon the subject in the last paragraph—that of a slave code. But this topic we must reserve for another day.

The Absurdities of the Canvass.

The St. Louis *Democrat*, a Republican paper which advocates the expulsion of free negroes from the United States, the Danite papers which advocate the introduction of slavery into the free States, and the Republican papers of Illinois which have no principles except abolitionism, all agree in opposing Douglas. And the happy manner in which they unite in this business is astonishing. The St. Louis *Democrat* recently arraigned Douglas in a fierce article, the first section of which is as follows:

DOUGLAS' LOVE FOR POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY EXEMPLIFIED.

While the Douglas-Toombs bill was pending—from which Mr. Douglas had stricken the clause requiring the submission of the Kansas constitution to a vote of the people, and to which he had added another clause by which the convention was debarred from submitting it—while this bill was pending, Mr. Chase offered the following amendment.

This article is copied extensively in the Republican papers of Illinois, and we notice that a Danite paper published in Quincy, and edited by Judge Skinner, not only copies it, but makes it the groundwork of a ponderous argument upon Douglas' treachery in not voting for Chase's amendment to the Toombs bill.

The answer to the story is that it is a wholesale fiction, got up to catch ignorant dupes. The Toombs bill was introduced into the Senate June 25, 1856, and Mr. Chase was elected Governor of Ohio in October, 1855, and entered upon its duties on the first of January, 1856,—six months before the Toombs bill was heard of, consequently he never offered any amendment to that bill, and had not been a member of the Senate for nearly eighteen months previously.

THANKSGIVING IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The Governor of New Hampshire has appointed Thursday, November 25, as a day of Thanksgiving. It is the first appointment yet made, and the day selected, which is the one usually chosen in Massachusetts, will doubtless be generally elected by other Governors.

That Unfortunate Washington Union.

ANOTHER DISPLAY OF IGNORANCE—OR WORSE.

In the Washington *Union* of October 6, is a review of the "record" of Judge Douglas. It occupies nearly four columns of the paper, as a whole, it is puerile, garbled, and glaringly false. It is written under the inspirations of bad temper, and its literary defects would be a disgrace to a boy of ten years of age. As a sample of its historical accuracy, and of its mode of argument, we extract from it the strongest point it makes. The editor is endeavoring to prove that Judge Douglas in the Kansas Nebraska act, intended to make the question of slavery in the territories subject to the decision of the Supreme Court, and, that, in order to have the question brought before the court, and its decision thus obtained, he inserted in the Nebraska act a most extraordinary provision. We give the charge as made by the *Union*, with the italics exactly as they occurred in that paper. Here it is:

That this was the agreement of the two parties supporting the Nebraska Kansas bill is abundantly shown by the debates, from which we have not room to quote. It is also conclusively shown by the terms of the bill itself, which allows an appeal from any decision in the territory directly to the Supreme Court of the United States in all cases in which the title to property in a slave was raised. The 27th section of the bill provides that writs of error and appeal "shall be allowed, and may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States in the same manner and under the same regulations as from the circuit court of the United States, where the value of property or the amount in controversy, &c., &c., &c., shall exceed one thousand dollars, *except only that in all cases involving title to slaves* the said writ of error or appeal shall be allowed and decided by said Supreme Court *without regard to the value of the matter, property, or title in controversy*, and except, also, that a writ of error or appeal shall also be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Supreme Court created by this act, or of any judge thereof, or of the district courts created by this act or of any judge thereof, upon *any writ of habeas corpus involving the question of personal freedom*."

Here are two most important exceptions created by this bill in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States—*exceptions not to be found in any other territorial bill*. Why were they made? The answer is too palpable to admit of doubt. It was to facilitate the adjudication by the Supreme Court of this very subject in controversy, and thus permanently settle the question of territorial power.

The whole force of this proposition, if it have any force, consists in the allegation that this provision contained in the 27th section of the Kansas-Nebraska act was something new; that it allowed appeals, &c., upon questions involving personal freedom, which had never been allowed before. Had the blockhead who edits the Washington *Union* had the least regard for his own reputation either as a man of intelligence or truth, he would never have put on record such a statement. Any reader, by turning to Little & Brown's edition of the Statutes at Large, vol. 9, page 450, will find in the act establishing a territorial government for New Mexico, approved Sept. 9, 1850, the following provision:

SEC. 10. * * * * "Writs of error and appeals from the final decisions of said supreme court shall be allowed, and may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, in the same manner and under the same regulations as from the circuit courts of the United States, where the value of the property or the amount in controversy, to be ascertained by the oath or affirmation of either party, or other competent witness, shall exceed one thousand dollars; except only that in all cases involving title to slaves, the said writs of error or appeals shall be allowed and decided by the said supreme court without regard to the value of the matter, property, or title in controversy; and except also that a writ of error or appeal shall also be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the said supreme court created by this act, or of any judge thereof, or of the district courts created by this act, or of any judge thereof, upon any writ of habeas corpus involving the question of personal freedom."—*U. S. Statutes at Large, vol. 9, p. 450.*

Here, in the act establishing the territory of New Mexico, passed four years before the Kansas-Nebraska act, we find the same provisions in the precise words of the Kansas act, and which the ignoramus of the *Union* pretends and asserts were never heard of until Judge Douglas invented them for a special purpose under the Nebraska bill!

On pages 455, 456, of the same volume of the Statutes at Large, the editor of the *Union* might have found the act establishing the territory of Utah; and in section 9 of that act he might have found the identical language and provisions which we have quoted from the New Mexico act, and which the *Union* pretends were never heard of until the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act!

Nay, more, instead of the provisions for an appeal and writs of error to the Supreme Court of the United States from all decisions of the territorial courts upon questions involving title to slaves and rights of personal freedom being originated by Judge Douglas in the Kansas-Nebraska bill for the benefit of the slaveholder, that provision was not, as we have shown, originated in that act, nor was he the author of it at all. Its paternity belongs to John P. Hale, who, while the New Mexico bill was under discussion in 1850, in order to give the slave the right to have his case appealed to the highest tribunal of the land, moved to amend the bill by inserting the provision we have quoted from that act. His amendment was adopted, and became part of the law. It was subsequently inserted into the Utah act, and then, in 1854, was, as a matter of course, included in the Kansas-Nebraska act.

The *Union* closes its review with the following sentence:

Thus not only are his doctrines unsound, but he is guilty of a gross breach of faith to his party and to the South, and shown that his heart is as treacherous as his principles are rotten.

The editor of the *Union*, who had, in order to reach that conclusion, to falsify history, pervert truth, garble speeches, suggest falsehoods and suppress facts—who had, in short, to commit acts which a gentleman would scorn, of which a clown would be ashamed, and a man of intelligence, though lost to all sense of respect for the opinions of others, would shrink from, has the temerity to write of "treacherous hearts and rotten principles!" The foul promptings of his own heart find their appropriate publicity in a glaring display of a total want of principle, personal or political.

The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

The effect of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise is beginning at last to be properly appreciated at the North. Eli Thayer, a leading member of the present Congress from Massachusetts, in a speech, an extract of which we copy to-day, on first page, declared that had not that compromise been repealed Kansas would now be filled with slaves.

The Lawrence (Kansas) *Herald of Freedom*, the great free State organ of Kansas, in a recent article sustaining Douglas, uses the following language, which we respectfully submit to the [illegible] of Illinois:

With the Dred Scott decision we take the broadest issue, as we did to Mr. Douglas' squatter sovereignty position, and yet the squatter sovereignty principle has been made to advance the cause of freedom. Had the Missouri compromise never been repealed, we are firm in the conviction that Kansas would have been made a slave State by the natural working of the laws of emigration, just as the Platte Purchase became densely populated with slaves, though still under the operation of the Missouri compromise, it never having been formally repealed, so far as relates to that portion of Missouri.

The Dred Scott decision will have a similar effect upon the country and the territories. We, in Kansas, and the people of the States and other territories, will discuss the question, and arouse the public mind against it, and Judge Douglas has the honor of suggesting the manner of meeting the matter *legally*. It will be met in Kansas, not at the ballot box, but silently and effectually in the next territorial legislature. Douglas' position on that question is but a natural offshoot of his popular sovereignty position.

From the Springfield Register, Oct. 8.

Hon. John T. Stuart.

The *Journal* of Tuesday has a jesuitical contradiction of a statement of the St. Louis *Republican*, in regard to the position of this gentleman. It quibbles thus: "In common with ninety nine hundredths of the Whigs of Illinois, Mr. Stuart says he is not for Mr. Douglas." The *Journal* has no authority for making any such assertion. Mr. Stuart is a private citizen, not engaged in politics, further than his individual vote is concerned, and and in view of his personal relations to Mr. Lincoln, takes no part in the senatorial controversy, but the *Journal* misrepresents him when it undertakes to create the impression that he sympathises with or favors Republicanism in its fanatical agitation of the slavery question.

We are authorized by Mr. Stuart to state that, ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION HE COINCIDES WITH MR. DOUGLAS—*that he is wholly opposed to the Republican party, and* TO ANY FUSION BY WHIGS WITH THEM—that on account of his *personal* relations to Mr. Lincoln, he is unwilling to take any part in the senatorial contest, and shall not vote for representatives to the legislature.

Will the Illinois *Journal* have the fairness to state Mr. Stuart's position correctly?

☞ The workmen in the Gosport, Va., Navy Yard have contributed $700 for the relief of the yellow fever sufferers of New Orleans and Charleston.

Lincoln Repudiated by Another Organ.

Of the many Republican organs in this vicinity, there is no one of them exercising a greater influence, or possessing half the circulation there is enjoyed by the *Congregational Herald*, edited by the Rev. W. A. Nichols, Rev. Wm. Patton, Rev. S. C. Bartlett, and Rev. J. E. Roy, all of this city. In the issue of that paper of the 30th of September, Mr. Lincoln is handled without gloves. He is arraigned, not because he is any the less an advocate of negro equality now than he has ever been, but because of his cowardice in attempting to avoid his often declared and well known principles. The *Herald*, with a candor that might well be imitated by the other Republican papers of the State, declares that it will "train in no organization that is *mean enough* to call itself, or be called by its chosen leader, 'the white man's party.'" It supported him because of the strong stand he took in his Chicago speech in favor of "negro equality," and it is ashamed of his cowardice in allowing Douglas to terrify him into a denial of his real principles. We have not room for the entire article, but give some extracts, which express a pretty clear conviction that while it is admitted that Lincoln is as good a negro equality man as ever, he has lost the support of thousands in this vicinity by attempting to deny it. The *Herald* says:

"In the present case, it could scarcely be expected that we should feel any sympathy with Senator Douglas, in view of his malignant attacks on the Northern ministers, his championship of the interests of slavery, and his most obnoxious measures against freedom. On the other hand we could hardly avoid a deep sympathy with the Republican party as his antagonists, provided a *clean issue* was made with him and the battle was fought in defence of principle. This we at first hoped would be the case, and our hopes were strengthened by Mr. Lincoln's first speech, when he opened the campaign in this city in reply to Mr. Douglas. We thought a champion had been found who would stand by the Declaration of Independence and fight for *human* rights, for *man as man*, irrespective of color, race, creed, or other accidental circumstances.

"But we are disappointed. The issue for the hour does not seem to have been found in this great State. Our standard bearer has faltered thus soon, while the conflict has only begun. Mr. Lincoln's speech at Freeport shook our confidence in him as a true exponent of Republicanism to any genuine sense. There Mr. Douglas, following up the Ottawa debate, drove him from the ground of 'no more slave States' in any event, and induced him to waver generally in his adhesion to thorough anti slavery doctrines and measures.—But his recent speeches at Charleston have nearly destroyed our faith in him as a fit man to represent this Empire State of the West in the national Senate. It requires something more in a Senator at this day of crisis, than a vague sympathy with freedom. He must adopt its radical principles and stand by them in victory or in defeat. Wit, sharp repartee, readiness of speech, good humor, effective stump oratory, eminent in canvassing, but they cannot compensate for moral cowardice, or ignorance of the first truths of liberty.

"Mr. Lincoln deliberately, and with repetition, declared himself to be opposed to placing colored men on a political equality with white men. He made color and race the ground of political proscription. He forsook *principle*, and planted himself on *low prejudice*. These were his words, as reported by his friends:

"'I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races, (applause)—that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will for ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.'

"'Judge Douglas has said to you that he has not been able to get from me an answer to the question whether I am in favor of negro citizenship. So far as I know, the Judge never asked me the question before. (Applause.) He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. (Renewed applause.) This furnishes me an occasion for saying a few words upon the subject. I mentioned in a certain speech of mine which has been printed, that the Supreme Court had decided that a negro could not possibly be made a citizen, and without saying what was my ground of complaint in regard to that, or whether I had any ground of complaint, Judge Douglas has from that thing manufactured nearly everything that he ever says about my disposition to produce an equality between the negroes and the white people. (Laughter and applause.) If any one will read my speech, he will find I mentioned that as one of the points decided in the course of the Supreme Court opinions, but I did not state what objection I had to it. But Judge Douglas tells the people what my objection was when I did not tell them myself. (Loud applause and laughter.) Now my opinion is that the different States have the power to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power I should be opposed to the exercise of it. (Cries of "good," "good," and applause.) That is all I have to say about it.'

"Let the anti slavery men of Illinois read the above and answer whether these are their sentiments. Had Mr. Lincoln pronounced against ignorance and immorality in citizens, and proposed to restrict the right of suffrage to all who could read and write and were possessed of a reputable character, whether white or black, American, European, Asiatic or African, we would have assented, because the idea is impartial, and based on a broad principle. But when he proscribes an entire class of the population, irrespective of intelligence or character, merely because of color and race, we hesitate not to affirm that he has fallen from a position which we can respect, and has planted himself on the Douglas platform. He does not represent us, or thousands of other liberty loving citizens of Illinois. We have no enthusiasm for his success, although we have enthusiasm for the defeat of his opponent, and the great scheme which is pending on his triumph. Freedom can wait for a better leader. In the attempt to conciliate the pro slavery prejudices of men in the central and southern portions of the State, Mr. Lincoln is fast losing the sympathy of his supporters in the northern part. We have kept silence while silence was possible, BUT NOW SPEAK OUT, THAT POLITICIANS MAY KNOW THAT CHRISTIAN MEN ARE NOT IN THE MARKET, TO BE SOLD TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER, AND THAT WE WILL NOT FOLLOW THE NAME OF REPUBLICANISM WITHOUT THE REALITY. *Our* battle with Mr. Douglas is one of *principle*, in behalf of *universal human rights*. We shall train in no organization that is mean enough to call itself, or be called by its chosen leader, 'The White Man's Party.'"

From the Boston Courier, Oct. 6.

The Only Way Kansas could Have been made a Free State.

The Republican party should look after Eli Thayer. He is too dangerous a man—that is, too dangerous for his own party—to be allowed to go at large without a keeper. He has been lately making a speech at Albany, in which he stated, without qualification or hesitation, that he does not know how Kansas could have been made a free State if the Missouri compromise had not been repealed. To us outsiders, who are naturally curious to learn the exact creed and platform of the several parties which are struggling for supremacy in the land just now—especially at this moment, when the signs of the times indicate a reconstruction of parties, and a new drawing of party lines—such declarations are quite puzzling. We have been in the habit of regarding Mr. Thayer as one of the most sincere and zealous of Republicans, indeed, a Republican and something more, but this sentiment is in direct opposition to what, so far as we can learn, has been and is a leading doctrine of that party. If the repeal of the Missouri compromise has been in its practical results a boon to freedom (and herein we have the honor to agree with Mr. Thayer), why has there been such an outpouring of the vials of Republican wrath against the measure? and again, what is there for the Republican party to do in the future, if the present position of things is as favorable to their professed objects?

Mr. Thayer not only acquiesces in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, but he gives his full adherence to the doctrine of popular sovereignty. He says:

"We must take up the gauntlet which the Democratic party and the South have thrown down, *and carry out the true principles of popular sovereignty*. Contrast our powers of combination and of locomotion, our intelligence and our wealth with those of the South. Look at our unencumbered population—Massachusetts, with her 150, Connecticut, with her 112, New York with her 76, population to the square mile—and contrast them with the 89 100ths of a man to a square mile of the South, and judge of the competition they are able to set up in regard to the Territories.

Ask no odds at the hands of slave holders. Meet them boldly on the common ground of the territories, and let the strongest prevail. But the Federal Government must keep its hands off. Then if we want free States, we have only got to go and make them. We can go and make them at the West, we can go and make them at the South. Slavery cannot go and seize the territories, it cannot even keep the States it has in such a contest. Plant colonies, build cities of free people, with their schools, churches, manufactories and printing presses, and freedom will be triumphant and universal."

Old Hardcastle, in "She Stoops to Conquer," said of Marlow's conduct in his house (a supposed inn) that it might be modern modesty, but it looked to him confoundedly like old fashioned impudence. The sentiments of the paragraphs above quoted may be modern Republicanism, but, viewed through our spectacles, they look confoundedly like old fashioned democracy. Now, Mr. Wilson, who was making a speech at New York at about the same time Mr. Thayer was at Albany, proclaimed with the greatest vehemence that one of the things the Republican party had to do, in its way to take possession of the government, was to compel Congress to take the back track, and by legislative enactment exclude slavery from the territories. Here are two conspicuous men in the Republican party in direct issue on this question of popular sovereignty—one accepting and the other rejecting it. And what a commentary this fact is upon the present position of the party!

RARITY OF A TRUE GENTLEMAN.—Perhaps a gentleman is a rarer gentleman than some of us think for. Which of us can point out many such in his circle; men whose aims are generous, whose truth is constant, and not only constant in its kind, but elevated in its degree; whose want of meanness makes them simple, who can look the world honestly in the face with an equal manly sympathy for the great and the small? We all know now a hundred whose coats are very well made, and a score who have excellent manners, and one or two happy beings who are what they call in the inner circles, and who have shot into the very centre and bull's eye of fashion; but of gentlemen how many? Let us take a little scrap of paper and each make out his list.—*Thackeray*.

Burnt in Effigy.

In the course of a speech a few days ago, Capt. Connell said he had often been informed that Lincoln had been burnt in effigy by the soldiers fighting the battles of their country in Mexico, when up rose a man who was a volunteer in that war, and gave the weight of his testimony in support of the assertion. This returned soldier said—and he is a man whose truth is relied on—that he had personal knowledge of the fact, that he saw the effigy, that Lincoln had an infamous reputation all through the division of the army to which he, the returned soldier, belonged. As may well be supposed, the effect of Capt. Connell's allusion to the reported fact, and the prompt support the allusion received by an eye-witness, occasioned a thrill of indignant feeling to pass through the entire crowd.

Whether it be true, or not, that Lincoln was absolutely burned in effigy by any portion of the American soldiers in Mexico, we will not undertake to say—but that such is the honest impression of the soldier under notice, we have no doubt. And this is the view which Capt. Connell took of it. He said, we are informed by one who was present, that it was sufficient proof of the fact that Lincoln, by his speeches, and general conduct, while the war was pending, made himself odious to the American army in Mexico, that one who acted in that army holds the impression that he was actually singled out from the rest of the unpatriotic opposers of the war, and burned in effigy! The point was well put, it had its effect.

The Young Men for Douglas.

In many towns of this State the young men, who were raised Republicans, or were lead into Republicanism during the exciting period of two years ago—but who now are supporting the Democracy under the leadership of Douglas—are forming themselves into organized numbers, the better to operate in the canvass, and the more surely to make their votes effective at the polls. We have been occasionally apprised of this movement, for several weeks past, and now we have numerous facts at hand which show the extent and indicate the results of this praiseworthy stand taken by hundreds of the independent young men in the Republican party. What has been done, up to this time, has been done unostentatiously, and the workers have not been seen, in most instances, in their works. They have chosen to conduct the movement quietly, and in their own way, and none have a right to complain.

One of these young men, residing in a large interior town, met an *old* Republican on Dearborn street one day last week, when he was asked if he supported Lincoln? No—he answered—I shall vote the Douglas ticket. "Why," rejoined the *old* Republican, "you voted with us last year!" "Yes," replied our young friend—"and the year before. But that don't prevent my helping the State to do a good thing for herself and for the Union,—Illinois owes it to herself to return Stephen A. Douglas to the Senate." This was almost too much for the still steadfast Republican but he rallied, and inquired if there were any more young men like him in his district? "Only a thousand or two," was the deliberate reply.

This little colloquy gives some inkling of how matters are going. We are content to await developments.

The California Elections.

A gentleman residing in California, has written a letter touching the recent elections in that state, to the editors of the Richmond *Enquirer*, to whom he is known, and who compliment him by styling him a "sound Democrat and reliable man." We copy a paragraph.

SAN FRANCISCO, Sept 5th, 1858.

I wish to write only a few lines to you, posting you correctly upon our State elections, which took place on the first day of this month. The Democratic party have triumphed over all combinations in the election of Joseph G. Baldwin, [author of "Party Leaders"] to the vacancy on the Supreme bench of this State, over Mr. Curry, the candidate of the combined opposition. Curry never gave a Democratic vote in his life, and was a most active member of the know Nothing organization, and has been everything else besides. Baldwin was with Wise and Douglas previous to the passage of the English bill, on the principle, and gave only his adhesion to the compromise. The resolutions adopted by our State Convention were drawn by a Douglas Democrat, Mr. Hager, and our nominations were made without regard to their opinions on the Kansas question. Baldwin's election was consequently a splendid victory for us.

From the Ohio Statesman, of Oct. 6.

The State House on Fire!

GREAT LOSS OF VALUABLE DOCUMENTS.

About five o'clock yesterday morning those of our citizens residing in the vicinity of the State Capitol buildings were aroused by the alarm of fire, given by the workmen on the artesian well in the State House yard. It was discovered that the basement room in the northeast corner of the building directly under the office of the Secretary of State, and used by the Secretary as a store room and by workmen as a paint shop, was being rapidly enveloped in flames. A few minutes after the first alarm the steam fire engine was on the ground, and was soon followed by the "Rapid" machine. An immense volume of smoke escaped through the ten windows, followed by streams of flame leaping up into the very faces of the firemen, making it extremely difficult to reach the point from which the fire arose, as all the accesses leading to the room were locked and full of smoke. A large pile of stationery, wrapping and printing paper, in a corner of the subterranean room, was wrapped in flames, and it was almost impossible to reach it with water.

But the strenuous exertions of the firemen were successful and the flames succumbed after an hour's hard work. The room was opened, but for once the interior was as hot as a furnace. The stationery in the room, valued at about $400, was totally destroyed. Almost $300 worth of library glass, just placed in the room the day before, was a total loss. Considerable painting apparatus and raw materials, valued at from two to three hundred dollars, belonging to the contractor, Hamilton Cummings, of Cincinnati, were destroyed. Five or six hundred volumes of public documents, embracing the only complete set extant of documents from the first organization of the territorial government to the present time, were totally ruined. These documents were of great value as records, and it will be impossible to replace them. Their real value is incalculable, though probably the whole lot would not sell for $100. The total loss of the State will probably reach $1,500, aside from the expense of repairing the room, the walls, windows, and doors of which are considerably damaged.

As to the origin of the fire nothing is known.

DECIDEDLY COOL ELOPEMENT FOR THE YELLOW FEVER SEASON.—We heard something yesterday, illustrative of the fact that the devil will break out in spots among the best of people. The circumstance was the elopement, or mysterious disappearance of a lady wife to one of our most respectable merchants, and mother to three small children. Who she went with, or where she went to, was unknown to our informants. The husband, we should state, is now in the North. The guilty wife left a note for her husband's digestion, on his arrival home, to the effect that he needn't concern himself about the children, as one of them was his. A relative of the wife, (so we are told,) pursued her to her whereabouts, and exhausted his eloquence in a fruitless effort to persuade her to save her reputation and her husband's happiness—husband, children, and all. It is said that she spurned the idea, alleging disparity of age, disagreement of temper, etc., as full justification for the course she had taken. If the story, as related to us be true, it is a hard case for more than one person about town.—*New Orleans Crescent*, 21st.

DEMOCRATIC GAINS.—Democracy is rapidly recovering from its reverses of the Fremont Presidential campaign, and in every State where an election has been held this year, has made remarkable gains. If any one doubts, the annexed figures will speak for themselves. In two years the Democrats have gained 80,000 votes in eight States—of which 54,000 was made in the *free* States, and 24,000 in the slave States.

	1856.		1858.		Dem. Gain.
Maine	24,000	Rep. majority	3,000	Rep. maj.	21,000
N. Hampshire	6,000	" "	3,000	"	3,000
Vermont	28,000	" "	18,000	"	10,000
Connecticut	10,000	" "	2,500	"	7,500
California	3,500	Rep. Am. maj.	500	Dem. maj.	11,000
Missouri	9,000	Dem. maj.	25,000	"	16,000
Kentucky	7,000	"	13,000	"	6,000
N. Carolina	11,000	"	16,000	"	5,000
Total Democratic gain					80,000

☞ In the last number of the Boston *Pilot* we find the following just sentiments. No religious paper of the Union exercises a more commanding influence than the *Pilot*:

SENATOR DOUGLAS.—As far as we can judge, the eminent, influential, and conservative statesmen of the South are opposed to the plan of opposing the re-election of Judge Douglas on account of his opposition to the English Kansas bill. We are pleased to observe this decided manifestation of moderation on the part of our Southern statesmen. Nothing can be more suicidal to the interests of the Democratic party than the course pursued towards the Judge by some of the unreflecting friends of the party. Even if they prevail against Douglas, their only reward will be the contempt of that very South, whose interests they seem to have taken into their especial keeping.

ADVICE TO THE AMERICAN PARTY IN ILLINOIS.—The Louisiana (Mo.) *Times*, an American paper, addressing the members of its party in Illinois, says:

"We think that they (the Americans) should not vote for Lincoln under any circumstances, as the American party have been fooled several times by such men. Take, for instance, Banks and Wilson of Massachusetts, or Campbell, of Ohio, and several more such that we could name, and say, what have they done for the party? The above named gentlemen were all elected as Americans, and they have done more against the party than any three men in the country; and, if we are not mistaken, Mr. Lincoln is one of the same class of politicians, and we would say, in all sincerity, *beware of all such friends*."

DARK DAYS

[illegible]

Items of News and Other Matters.

The Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* publishes a table showing the amount of rain that has fallen at that place since January, 1848, together with the water from melted snow. The entire quantity amounts to a depth of forty feet and two inches on a level. It is fortunate that they did not all fall at once.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company have ordered twenty station indicators to be placed on the cars of that road. The indicator is so arranged that after passing a station the conductor pulls a cord and the name of the next station appears. The sound of a bell calls the attention of the passengers to it.

The Sons of Malta of Pittsburg recently turned out and paraded the streets of that city on horseback. There were 152 in their cowls, their white robes and their masks. The horses they rode were also dressed in white, and decorated with the cross of Malta. The whole town was out to see them, and to hear the band of music that led them.

The Philadelphia *Mount Vernon Record* announces that Alabama has contributed more than any other State towards the fund for the purchase of the home and tomb of Washington.

No further official announcements have been made in regard to the Brighton (Mass.) bank defalcations. The amount taken by the cashier will not vary far from $14,000. Nearly all this sum is secured to the bank by the cashier's bonds and private property. No action has been taken against the defaulter.

A man named Graham, while walking quietly along the streets in Louisville, a few days ago, was attacked by two large bull dogs belonging to a German, and dreadfully lacerated. They first bit him in the leg which threw him down, and then in various parts of the body and his arms, one of which he had thrown across his throat to protect it. A woman and a few men who were at work on a new house close by came to Mr. Graham's rescue, otherwise he would have been killed.

A great yacht race came off at Toronto, Canada, on Friday of last week, for a prize of $240, to which vessels from all parts of Canada and from the American shore of Lake Ontario participated. ...

THE WEEKLY TIMES.

The Elections Yesterday.

Under the telegraphic head will be found such returns of the elections yesterday as came to hand before the paper went to press.

REMOVED.—James W. Keys has been removed from the office of postmaster at Springfield, and Morris Lindsay has been appointed in his place.

As this removal was made at the especial request of Lincoln's friends, and for the especial purpose of aiding his election, we have a reasonable hope that the Democracy of Sangamon will return the compliment by electing two Democrats to the legislature to rebuke the insult.

Contradicts the Story—of Course.

Wentworth denies having made the statement which we copied from the New Hampshire *Gazette*, as to his opinion that Douglas will beat Lincoln. Of course, he will deny it. He talks loudly here for Lincoln, but is determined to defeat him. He even pretends to support Peck—but no man is deceived. Wentworth not only made the speech we have quoted, but meeting with a Republican who was anxious for Douglas' defeat, he got a relative to bet two hundred dollars that Douglas would be elected! The Republican put up the money, and though John does not figure in the transaction, still his money is up on Douglas. He said that he would have, for appearance sake, to spend two hundred dollars to elect Peck, and he determined, by betting on Douglas, to protect himself from loss.

A Mottled Candidate.

Abraham Lincoln was, in June last, proclaimed as the Republican candidate for the United States Senate by a convention of that party held at Springfield. He at once commenced the canvass by making a speech, which speech he was silly enough to have printed and distributed all over the State.

In that speech, relying upon the Whigs and Know Nothings and strict Republicans of middle Illinois as his supporters any how, he took the broad ground of negro equality, claiming for the negro the same political rights enjoyed by the white man, and asserting that these *rights* of the negro were derived from his Creator were "inalienable," and that it was an act of tyranny—such an act as George the Third exercised towards our Revolutionary ancestors—to keep them from the enjoyment of those "rights." A few weeks afterwards he made a speech at Chicago, in which he took the same position in substance, and he asked, if the State of Illinois undertook to make distinctions between white men and negroes, where those distinctions would stop? He thought the only safety for the Union rested in the immediate establishment of one political family in which negroes and white men should share in common the same privileges.

A few weeks thereafter, he was summoned to Ottawa, where, with his competitor, he addressed the people. He had, in the meantime, been among the people, and he found that the support he was deriving from the Washington *Union*, and the hirelings claiming to represent Mr. Buchanan, was not compensated by the loss of old Whigs, who did not relish negro equality. Hence, at Ottawa, he did not know whether he was for negro equality or not—he "was attending court in Tazewell" when that plank was put in his platform, and he was not prepared to say whether it was white or black.

Again, at Freeport, he met his antagonist, and by this time he had been able to get up his negro feeling once more, and forthwith he was for the universality of political privileges—the equality of the negro with the white man. He, however, had changed color in other respects. He would, he said, vote for the admission of slave States, he would resist all efforts to repeal the fugitive slave law, and he did not know, but he thought it likely, that he would submit to the Dred Scott decision.

Down to Jonesboro sped Mr. Lincoln on the 15th of September, and lo, the black man's friend, the negro equality champion, the defender of the Declaration of Independence, and the hero of political rights, avowed himself as "a white man," a member of the "white man's party," and one who never would admit a negro to any political privilege, and warmed by these sentiments so new upon his lips, he hurried up to Charleston, and there, on the 18th of September, actually endorsed the Dred Scott decision by declaring that a negro was not a citizen of the United States, and that if the Supreme Court had decided that Illinois could make negroes citizens, he would resist the exercise of any such power by this State.

The next appearance of Mr. Lincoln was at Galesburg, the centre of abolitiondom in this State. He had damaged himself extensively in the estimation of the abolitionists by his Jonesboro and Charleston speeches, and they insisted that he should recant, and put on the black garb of negro equality once more. He did so, and behold the white man of Jonesboro and the Dred Scottite of Charleston came forth at Galesburg clothed in the habiliments of Uncle Tom, praying the admission of his colored brethren to the rights and privileges of white men. He speaks at Quincy to-day, and at Alton on Friday, and the regalia of the "negro's friend" will be thrown aside, and he will clamor again against the negro race, and the ridiculous idea of their ever becoming citizens.

Such, men of Illinois, is the candidate before you asking for your suffrages. He belongs to the white men's party at one place, and anon! he becomes a most piteous complainant for the poor race which Douglas would make "inferior." At Charleston he declares negroes to be inferior in the eyes of God and man, and should be treated as their Creator intended they should be treated—as "inferiors"—men outside of the human political party,—and at Galesburg he asserts that God created them the political equals of the white race, and that it is inhuman and anti-Christian to deny to them that equality. Such is the mottled candidate. Such are the mottled principles, and such the mottled exhibition presented to the people of Illinois in the person of Abraham Lincoln.

Railroad Matters.

CHICAGO AND FOND DU LAC RAILROAD COMPANY.

The following named gentlemen form the recently constituted Board of Directors of this company for the ensuing year:

John J. R. Pease, Janesville, Wis.; Albert Winslow, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Wiudrlaw Blake, Jefferson, Wis.; Albert L. Pritchard, Watertown, Wis.; Mason C. Darling, Fond du Lac, Wis.; George W. Washburn, Oshkosh, Wis.; Perry H. Smith, Appleton, Wis.; Charles T. Harvey, Marquette, Mich.; John P. Couplo, Chicago, Ill.; Henry Smith, Chicago, Ill.; William B. Ogden, Chicago, Ill.; George M. Bartholomew, Hartford, Conn.; Charles Butler, New York city.

President—William B. Ogden, Chicago, Illinois. Vice President and Attorney—Perry H. Smith, Appleton, Wis. Secretary and Treasurer—Charles Butler, New York city; Assistant Secretary—Jos. H. Redfield, Chicago, Ill.; Assistant Treasurer—George P. Lee, Chicago, Ill.

RAILROAD EARNINGS IN SEPTEMBER, 1858.—The earnings of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad in September, between Chicago and Burlington, a distance of 210 miles, were:

For Freight	$[illegible]
For Passengers	43,0[illegible]
For Mail and Miscellaneous	2,1[illegible]
Total	$1[illegible]

The earnings of the Quincy and Chicago (late Northern Cross) Railroad, extending from its junction with the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad at Galesburg, to Quincy, a distance of 100 miles, were:

For Freight	$15,5[illegible]
For Passengers	6,[illegible]
For Mail and Miscellaneous	[illegible]
Total	$[illegible]

☞ The N. Y. Herald says that the Queen of Spain has agents here, who have command of two millions of dollars, to be invested in this country. The same paper states that most of the crowned heads of Europe are doing an active business in the way of investments in the United States. Louis Philippe had large possessions in our republic, and Louis Napoleon has sent from three to five millions here to be invested by his agents. It is said that the greatest operators in this way are the petty princes of Germany, whose investments in American securities amount, it is believed, to fully fifty millions of dollars.

THE "GREAT COLORED CAT" OUTDONE.—At Portland, Me., a cute Yankee advertised a lecture on the "Humbug of Spiritualism," the point of which would be "letting the cat out of the bag," admission five cents only. A large audience gathered at the city hall on Wednesday evening, and the lecturer, after a few words on the nature of humbug, took from beneath his desk a bag, which he promptly opened, and out *sprung a veritable cat!* The audience, fortunately for the lecturer, relished the joke, and amid the burst of applause which followed, he let himself out of the lecture room.

TELEGRAPHIC.

ELECTION RETURNS!

Pennsylvania Election.

Philadelphia, Oct. 12—11 p. m.

It is believed that the whole People's ticket is elected in this city. That party claim the victory, and are marching in procession about the streets.

Montour county will give a Democratic majority on the State ticket of about 100. For Congress—the Opposition receives about 200 majority. Scranton, 12 maj.

As far as heard from Col. Scranton, Opposition, has 3,114 majority over J. McReynolds, the Democratic candidate for Congress in the 12th district.

Montour county, 2 wards give Scranton, opposition for Congress, 12th district, 400 majority, an opposition gain of 450. Luzerne in 5 boroughs, Scranton's majority 897.

Northumberland County, Campbell, opposition, for Congress, 11th district, has 80 majority.

One ward of Hollidaysburg, gives Blair, opposition for Congress, 17th district, 77 majority.

Berks County, Newhope, gives Roberts, Dem., for Congress, 7th district, 9 majority.

A democratic loss of 60, Chester County, Phoenixville, gives Hickman, anti Lecompton for Congress, 6th district, 140 majority. An anti Lecompton Dem. gain of 160 in Schuylkill township, Hickman's majority, 116.

Lancaster county in Lancaster, Hopkins, dem. for Congress, 4th district, has 160 majority. A heavy gain for Stevens, opposition.

Erie city, Democratic candidate for Congress, senate and sheriff have small majorities, balance of Republican ticket probably elected. In the county the Republican ticket is probably elected by a large majority.

Crawford county—three townships give 248 Republican majority.

In Bethlehem, Borough county, Shoemaker, Opposition, for Congress in the 13th district, 119 majority.

Fifth district as far as heard from, Wood, Opposition, for Congress, gains 49 over the vote of 1856. Conshohocken gives him 108 majority.

Eleventh district—Tamaqua gives Campbell, Opposition 193 majority.

Ninth district—Columbia Borough gives Stevens, Opposition, 87 majority.

Twelfth district—[illegible] township gives Scranton, Opposition, 150 majority.

Seventh district—Doylestown gives Roberts, Democrat, 25 majority.

Pittsburg, Oct. 12.

Returns come in slowly. Three wards of Pittsburg, three of Allegheny City, and two county districts heard from, give Covode, Republican, a majority. McKnight in three wards in Allegheny City, leads Williams 464. The whole Republican ticket is undoubtedly elected by large majorities.

Ohio Election.

Cincinnati, Oct. 12.

In the 1st Congressional district the vote is so close that the official returns must decide. In the 2d district, Gurley, opposition, is elected by about 1,500 majority. In Hamilton county, the whole opposition county ticket is elected.

THE WEEKLY TIMES.

EDITOR'S CORRESPONDENCE.

DOUGLAS IN TAZEWELL COUNTY.

PEKIN, October 2, 1858.

I see that the Black Republican papers have taken hold of the lie started by the *Press and Tribune*, that Senator Douglas is failing in health and voice, and are giving it circulation over the State. Senator Douglas never enjoyed better health than he does to-day; he has gained several pounds in flesh since he has been traveling about, and his voice is as clear and as full as it was the evening of his reception and speech at Chicago. With the lying *Press and Tribune* the wish is father to the thought. No doubt Deacon Bross nightly prays that Douglas' voice may fail, or some accident happen which will prevent his continuing his canvass; but the prayers of the wicked availeth not, as the Deacon and the rest of the hypocritical, lying saints on his paper, have desired long before this. Senator Douglas will speak up to and on the day preceding the election, and the thousands who have not yet heard him will have an opportunity of listening to his powerful and truthful exposition of the creed of our party and the great issues now at stake, and will be able afterwards to cast their votes understandingly. Lincoln has addressed about one meeting to every three of Douglas, and even this light labor, for he never has many to listen to him, and it requires little exertion to make himself heard to the corporal's guard that usually collect to hear him, has worn him out, and he looks as if he could not bear up much longer. He is to be pitied, for I believe he really thought from the bluster of the *Press and Tribune* that he had the sympathies of the people, and now every place he visits convinces how [grossly] he has been deceived, and fills him with shame, disappointment and despair. Vain hopes and [blighted] ambition have destroyed Mr. Lincoln's [peace] of mind and bodily health, and I fear he will never recover from the severe ordeal through which he is now going.

I have another glorious demonstration to record. Old Tazewell to-day turned out stronger than ever before, and the pleasant little city of Pekin was actually crammed with people, it being difficult to find standing room even on the sidewalks or in the streets. Delegations from every township in the county came in at an early hour, and a large crowd was brought down from Peoria on the steamer [illegible], which they had chartered for the purpose, whilst another came up the Illinois river from Havana and the intermediate towns on the river. It was a splendid sight about noon to see the procession moving through the city, with its flags and banners, keeping step to the music of the Union. The day could not have been more propitious or beautiful, and seemed to have been made especially for the occasion, the bright summer's sun and the cool, invigorating breeze giving an elastic step to the old, and making all feel new life and vigor. There was plenty of enthusiasm to spare, the people showing that their hearts were in our cause. [illegible]

Douglas in Henderson County.

[illegible]

Douglas in Iowa.

[illegible]

Democratic Senatorial Convention—5th District.

[illegible]

A Voice from Missouri.

[illegible]

Douglas in Wisconsin.

[illegible]

"People of no Consequence."

[illegible]

Explosion of a Patent Coffee Pot.

[illegible]

SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

Bold Exposition by a Southern Democrat.

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

[illegible]

Breach of Promise Case in Mississippi.

[illegible]

THE PARAGUAY EXPEDITION.

Our Naval Strength to be Employed in Aid of Our Diplomacy.

[illegible]

Miscellaneous.

[illegible]

Miscellaneous.

[illegible]

Ayer's Cathartic Pills

[illegible]

REMOVAL, E. G. HALL & CO.

IRON, STEEL, NAILS, And Heavy Hardware,

[illegible]

HAYDEN, KAY & CO.

SADDLERY HARDWARE, BENT STOCK, Coach Trimmings, SPRING AXLES.

[illegible]

EAGLE WORKS,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

[illegible]

DOCTOR JAMES

[illegible]